COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL
PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY).
WINCHES FARM,
395, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS.

VOLUME 4. Parts 13/15 9th June, 1950
pp. 351—446.

23 JUN

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :	Page
Conclusions of Twelfth Meeting (*concluding instalment*)	351—353
Conclusions of Thirteenth Meeting	354—424
Conclusions of Fourteenth Meeting (*first instalment*)	425—446

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

by a non-binominal author and not validly republished by a binominal author prior to being cited in a specific synonymy and (2) a name which previously had existed only as a manuscript name or as a *nomen nudum*. Names of genera accidentally introduced into the literature in this way were usually ignored and it was desirable that official sanction should now be given to this practice.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that a generic name is not to be treated as having been published with an indication by virtue only of its having been published as the generic component of a specific name cited in a synonymy given for a nominal species, and accordingly that a generic name so published does not thereby acquire any status in zoological nomenclature.

Article 30 (question of the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy), Report by Secretary asked for

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 24)

37. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the question of the application to generic names published in generic synonymies of the provisions of Article 30, together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (103) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18.

It was pointed out that, under the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin (by which the ruling given in *Opinion* 5 was to be incorporated in the *Règles*) a generic name originally published before 1758 did not acquire any rights under the Law of Priority (Article 25) when after 1758 it was republished in a generic synonymy, for publication in this manner did not constitute either adoption or acceptance by the author by whom the name was so published. There remained however the case of manuscript generic names which first appeared in print after 1758 in generic synonymies. These names were in a position similar to that of manuscript trivial names, the position of which had been clarified by *Opinion* 4 (the ruling in which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin should now be incorporated in the *Règles*). There was however an essential difference in this matter between a manuscript trivial name first published in a specific synonymy on the one hand and a manuscript generic name first published in a generic synonymy on the other. For the manuscript trivial name, on being so published, could apply only to the same species as the nominal species of which it was published as a synonym. On the other hand, a genus established without a designated type species is indeterminate until its type species has been selected under Rule (*g*) (or exceptionally under Rule (*e*)) in Article 30. What species should therefore be treated as the type species of a genus, when its name,

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

after having existed first as a manuscript name (or a *nomen nudum*) was published in a generic synonymy ? Was the type species of such a genus automatically the same species as the type species of the nominal genus, of which the generic name in question had been published as a synonym ? Or was it an independent generic unit, for which a later author was free to select as the type species any of the species included in the genus to which the generic name in question was sunk as a synonym at the time of its first publication ? The question was a difficult one, for it often happened that, where a manuscript generic name "A" was first published as a synonym of a previously published generic name " B," the species on that occasion referred to the genus having the name " B " were different, in whole or in part, from those placed in that genus at the time when the generic name " B " was itself first published. These and other complicated aspects of the problem needed to be carefully examined before a decision was reached. It was thought desirable therefore that no decision should be taken at the present Session, but that an inquiry should be put in hand at once, so that a final decision could be taken by the Commission at its meeting to be held at the next (XIVth) Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems relating to the determination of the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in the synonymy of some other genus, and to submit a comprehensive Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission to the Congress of recommendations for the insertion in the *Règles* of appropriate provisions dealing with the above matter.

Thirteenth meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

38. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that, as the Commission and the Section had completed their examination of the proposals in regard to the amendment and clarification of the *Règles* submitted in the series of Commission Papers ending with Commission Paper I.C.(48)18, they should adjourn for a short break. He suggested that the Commission and the Section should meet again for their next joint meeting (which would be the Thirteenth Meeting of the Commission and the Fifth Meeting of the Section) at 1730 hours. The

first matter to be considered when the Commission resumed would be the proposals in regard to eight individual nomenclatorial problems submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48) 19.

After general concurrence in the foregoing proposal had been expressed both by the members of the Commission and by the members of the Section, THE COMMISSION agreed to adjourn until 1730 hours the same afternoon.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1635 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948.

CONCLUSIONS of the Thirteenth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1730 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present:

M. Belloc (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*

Eight individual problems of nomenclature raised in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19: procedure in regard to

1. THE COMMISSION had before them Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, containing proposals in regard to eight individual nomenclatorial problems.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

to examine in turn each of the eight proposals relating to individual problems of zoological nomenclature submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, for the purpose of reaching conclusions in regard thereto.

" Opinions " rendered without including an answer to all the points raised : arrangements for completion of

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the problem created by the fact that in the past *Opinions* had sometimes been rendered dealing with part only of the application submitted to the Commission in the case concerned, and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (1) in Commission Paper I.C.(48) 19. In the case of *Opinion* 82, to which attention had been drawn by Commissioner Boschma (file Z.N.(S.)201) the issue of the *Opinion* in an incomplete form appeared to have been due solely to inadvertence, for no issue of principle of any kind was raised by the question which had been omitted. In the case of *Opinion* 95, to which attention had been drawn by Professor Harold Kirby (file Z.N.(S.)245), the omission had been deliberate and had been stated to be due to a desire to provide further opportunity for consideration of the issues involved. In this case, the issue of an *Opinion* dealing with part only of an application was not open to objection ; what was a matter for criticism was that no action of any kind was ever taken subsequently to deal with the portion of the application on which a decision had been postponed.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note, with disapproval, of the practice by which in the past an *Opinion* had sometimes been rendered which dealt with part only of the application submitted, no decision having been taken either then or at a later date on the remainder of the application in question ;

(2) agreed to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine all the *Opinions* so far rendered by the Commission, with a view to ascertaining every instance where part only of an application had been dealt with, and to submit proposals as soon as possible for the rendering, as a matter of urgency, of supplementary *Opinions* dealing with the questions left unanswered in the earlier *Opinions* concerned.

" Calliphora " Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) to be added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : decision completing " Opinion " 82

3. THE COMMISSION had before them the proposal submitted by Commissioner Boschma (file Z.N.(S.)201) and supported in Point (2) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19 that an *Opinion* supplementary to *Opinion* 82 should now be rendered dealing with the application for the addition of the generic name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* which had been left undecided when *Opinion* 82 was rendered. The application was entirely non-controversial, once a decision had been taken (as it was in *Opinion* 82) on the type species of the genus *Musca*

Linnaeus, 1758, for the omission from that *Opinion* of a decision on the generic name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy could only be due to inadvertence.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to place the generic name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) (type species by original designation : *Musca vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and the trivial name *vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Musca vomitoria*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decision recorded in (1) above.

" Mabuya " Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia) : correction in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of entry relating to : correction of error in " Opinion " 92

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted in Point (3) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19 that an *Opinion* should at once be rendered correcting the erroneous entry on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in regard to the generic name *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia), which had occurred as the result of a mistake in *Opinion* 92. In that *Opinion* the type species of this genus had been stated to be *Scincus sloani* Daudin, 1803, a species which had not been referred to the genus *Mabuya* by Fitzinger when he founded that genus. The type species of this genus was *Lacertus mabouya* Lacépède, 1788, by absolute tautonymy.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the statement that *Scincus sloani* Daudin, 1803 was the type species of *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia) inserted in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* as the result of a mistake in *Opinion* 92 should be deleted and that in its place there should be inserted a statement that the type species was *Lacertus mabouya* Lacépède, 1788, by absolute tautonymy.

(2) to place the trivial name *mabouya* Lacépède, 1788 (as published in the binominal combination *Lacertus mabouya* on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decision recorded in (1) above.

" Porina " Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (proposed validation of, under the Commission's plenary powers) : rejection of proposal

5. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a proposal submitted by Dr. J. T. Salmon (New Zealand) that the generic name *Porina* Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), the name widely used for an important pasture pest in New Zealand, should be validated by the use by the

Commission of their plenary powers for the suppression of the older name *Porina* d'Orbigny, 1852 (Class Bryozoa) (file Z.N.(S.)194) ;

(b) a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (4) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19,(i) drawing attention to the fact that *Porina* d'Orbigny, 1852, was the name of a leading genus in the Class Bryozoa (Cretaceous Section), (ii) expressing the opinion that it would be wrong for the Commission to use their plenary powers to give relief to workers in one group of the Animal Kingdom if the adoption of that course were to cause confusion among, or inconvenience to, workers in another group, and (iii) recommending that for this reason the application specified in (a) above should be rejected.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to reject, for the reasons set out in Point (4) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, the application referred to in (a) above that they should use their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Porina* Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) by suppressing the generic name *Porina* d'Orbigny, 1852 (Class Bryozoa) ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 18*)

(2) in conformity with the decision in regard to the procedure in cases where an application for the use of the plenary powers is rejected taken at the meeting noted in the margin, to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the oldest available name for the genus for which the invalid name *Porina* Walker, 1856, had been published, namely the generic name *Oxycanus* Walker, 1856 (type species, by selection by Kirby (1892, *Syn. Cat. Lep. Het.* : 892) : *Oxycanus australis* Walker, 1856) ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 20*)

(3) in conformity with the decision in regard to the procedure to be adopted where the Commission either suppresses a generic name or rules that is invalid under the *Règles* taken at the meeting noted in the margin, to add the name *Porina* Walker, 1856 (type species, by monotypy : *Porina novaezealandiae* Walker, 1856), to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(4) to place the specific trivial name *australis* Walker, 1856 (as published in the binominal combination *Oxycanus australis*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

"Flebotomus" Rondani, 1840 : (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) Emendation of name to "Phlebotomus"

6. THE COMMISSION had under consideration applications in favour of the emendation of the generic name *Flebotomus* Rondani, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) to "*Phlebotomus*" submitted independently by Professor C. T. Brues (U.S.A.) and by Dr. G. B. Fairchild and Dr. Marshall Hertig (Mexico) (file Z.N.(S.)169), together with a summary of the issues involved submitted by the Secretary in Point (5) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19. In addition, Dr. Fairchild had furnished also letters of support for the emendation of this name which he had received from Dr. A. da Costa Lima (Brazil) and from Dr. Alan Stone (U.S.A.). As is well known, this name is of great importance in medical literature, where it is almost invariably spelt with an initial "Ph-" and not "F-", the former spelling being also in general, though not in universal, use in systematic literature. As had been pointed out by Mr. William F. Rapp, Jr. (U.S.A.), this generic name had been originally published by Rondani (in 1840) with an initial letter "F-", it not having been until 1846 that this spelling had been emended to the "Ph-" spelling by Agassiz. Two questions were involved : (1) whether the original "F-" spelling was due to an error, in which case it should be emended to the "Ph-" spelling under Article 19 of the *Règles* ; (2) if the original spelling was intentional, was this a case where, in order to prevent confusion, the Commission should use its plenary powers to validate the commonly accepted "Ph-" spelling ?

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when in 1944 Mr. Rapp had first suggested in the journal *Science* that the original spelling of *Flebotomus* should be restored, it had appeared to him, as Secretary to the Commission, that this was exactly the type of change in a name of importance in applied biology which ought not to be made on technical nomenclatorial grounds until the issues involved had been submitted to, and considered by, the Commission, for such changes were incomprehensible to, and were resented by, workers in those fields and should certainly be avoided, if at all possible. He had accordingly published a note inviting specialists to respect the "Ph-" spelling until the Commission had been able to consider the whole matter. When later he had himself looked into the origin of the word on which this generic name was based, he had found that no proper examination of this matter had ever been made. The technical problems involved were complex and he had had to appeal to expert linguists and lexicographers for advice,

As the result of these studies he had reached the conclusion that, from the standpoint of an educated Italian of the mid-XIXth century, such as Rondani, the " F-" spelling was correct and consequently that this was not a case which could properly be dealt with under Article 19 of the *Règles*. In view however of the importance of this name in medical literature, it seemed to him that a reversion to the spelling originally used by Rondani would lead to confusion outside systematic circles and was the type of name change which brought discredit on zoological nomenclature among workers who were not concerned with, or interested in, the minutiae of the rules adopted by zoologists for their own work. He accordingly commended to the favourable consideration of the Commission the request that the " Ph-" spelling of this name should be preserved by the Commission by the use of the plenary powers.

PROFESSOR L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that, speaking both as a zoologist and as an Italian, he was strongly in favour of the maintenance of the " Ph-" spelling of this well-known name. He was surprised that any other course should have been suggested.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to emend to *Phlebotomus* the generic name originally published by Rondani in 1840 as *Flebotomus* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) ;

(2) to place the generic name *Phlebotomus* Rondani, 1840 (type species : *Bibio papatasi* Scopoli, 1786, by monotypy) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and the trivial name *papatasi* Scopoli, 1786 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Bibio papatasi*), on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions recorded in (1) and (2) above.

" Papilio plexippus " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) : determination of identity of, under the plenary powers

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (United Kingdom) that they should use their plenary powers to determine the identity of the species to which the name *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), should be applied. Without such a ruling, there was no possibility of putting an end to the present state of confusion arising from the fact that this name was applied by all American and by many other lepidopterists to the common American Danaid species known in the United States as the " Monarch " but was used also by other lepidopterists for the common Indo-Oriental species of the same genus, to which the name *Papilio genutia* had

been given by Cramer in 1779 and which was universally known as *Danaus genutia* (Cramer) by all those workers who applied the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus to the "Monarch" butterfly. This case was dealt with in the Commission's file Z.N.(S.)323, and a summary of the issues involved was given in Point (6) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19 now before the Commission.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, speaking as a lepidopterist, he considered it essential that a decision should be taken by the Commission in this matter, for the species *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus was the type species of the well-known family DANAIDAE and the fact that that species was at present indeterminate was a cause of great confusion. There was no doubt that Linnaeus had included both the species concerned under the name *Papilio plexippus* in 1758; the short main description might refer to either species but the longer diagnosis could not apply to the North American "Monarch". On the other hand, Linnaeus had stated that this species occurred in North America and, in doing so, could only have been referring to the "Monarch". Later, moreover, he had elaborated this statement (in the *Mus. Lud. Ulr.*) by adding that he had received specimens from Peter Kalm, the Swedish naturalist who had collected for him in North America. On merits, therefore, it seemed to him (Commissioner Hemming) that the balance of the argument lay in favour of a decision that this name should apply to the American and not to the Indo-Oriental species. Looking at the question more generally, there were two reasons why he favoured a decision in this sense: (1) owing to its migratory habits a large non-systematic literature had accumulated in regard to this species. (2) it would be most confusing if the trivial name (*plexippus*) commonly applied to it were to be transferred to a closely allied species in the same genus, involving, as it would, exactly the type of name transfer which the Congress, when granting plenary powers to the Commission, had directed the Commission to prevent. It was to enable the Commission to deal adequately with cases of this type that the proposals set out in Point (82) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17 had been submitted by the Commission to, and had been approved by, the Section on Nomenclature at the present Congress. The use of those powers would involve the selection of a well-known and unmistakable figure of whatever species the Commission might direct to be the species to which the name *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, should apply. If the Commission were to decide in favour of the North American "Monarch", a suitable figure would be that which appeared as fig. 1 on plate 7 of Holland's

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

"*Butterfly Book*" (revised edition issued in 1931), a work which was known to, and readily accessible to, every worker in this group.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) supported the proposal that the Commission should use its powers to stabilise the manner in which this name should be used. The solution suggested would, he believed, be generally welcomed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*) should be applied to the American species figured as *Danais plexippus* by Holland (W. J.), 1931, *Butterfly Book* as figure 1 on plate 7 ;

(2) to place the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*), as determined in (1) above on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions recorded in (1) and (2) above.

"Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) (type species of) : determination of, with the minimum of further delay

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note by the Secretary (submitted in Point (7) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19) summarising the history of the application for the determination of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), which had been before the Commission for over twenty years (file Z.N.(S.)78).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as the records of the Commission showed, the Commission had in the past deliberately adopted a dilatory policy in dealing with this matter for fear that, whatever decision might be given, an important group of ornithologists would be offended through being required to change their established practice. No more bankrupt or unwise policy could be imagined, for the delay which had been allowed to occur had greatly enhanced the difficulties inherent in any solution, for the issue now involved was not only the name of a well-known genus of birds but also the name of a Family and Order based upon that genus. These names could not properly be used both for the grebes and for the divers, and the longer that they were used indiscriminately for both these groups the greater would become both the confusion in ornithological literature and the difficulty of securing a return to

uniformity. Serious-minded ornithologists, including Dr. Alexander Wetmore, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, were anxious to see the Commission face its responsibilities in this matter by rendering an *Opinion* stating what was the type species of this genus under the *Règles*. The Commission could not deal with this question during their present Session, for they would need first to be furnished with, and to study carefully, a comprehensive and objective examination of the nomenclatorial issues involved and of the arguments which had been adduced in favour of each of the two possible solutions. He hoped, however, that the Commission would place on record their determination to reach a decision on this case with the least further delay possible and should initiate such action as they might consider calculated to promote this end.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed :—

(a) that it was important that a decision on the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), should be taken with the least possible further delay ;

(b) that, in order to assist the Commission in taking a decision on the foregoing question, the delay in the consideration of which had been due less to its intrinsic difficulty than to its controversial character, it was desirable that the Commission should be furnished with a report on the issues involved prepared by a zoologist who was an authority on nomenclature but was not himself an ornithologist and who therefore had not had to prejudge this question in the course of his own work ;

(2) in view of (1)(b) above, invited Commissioner Francis Hemming to examine the question of what species was under the *Règles* the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), and to furnish a Report thereon at the earliest possible moment ;

(3) agreed to examine the issues involved and to reach a decision thereon immediately upon receipt of the Report referred to in (2) above.

Unnecessary delays in reaching decisions on individual nomenclatorial problems involving controversial, though not necessarily difficult, issues : need for the avoidance of

9. Arising out of the discussion on the question of principle raised at the end of Point (7) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19, recorded in Conclusion 8 above, THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note of, and disapproved, the unnecessary delays which had been allowed to occur in reaching a decision on the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) ;

(2) placed on record their conviction that, where an application relating to an individual nomenclatorial problem raised controversial, though not necessarily difficult, issues the deliberate adoption of procedures leading to unnecessary delays in reaching a decision was calculated both to prejudice the attainment of stability in the nomenclature of the group concerned and also to impair the authority and prestige of the Commission as an effective, impartial international tribunal ;

(3) affirmed their intention in future to avoid all unnecessary delays in reaching decisions on applications of the kind specified in (2) above and to give an answer to such questions promptly and without fear or favour.

Linnean system of binominal nomenclature not available for the nomenclature of monsters : generic and trivial names published for such purposes to have no status in zoological nomenclature

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a communication received from Professor R. T. Leiper (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)285) drawing attention to the misuse of the Linnean system of nomenclature to denominate certain types of monster (1) by Gurlt (1832, *Lehrbuch der pathologischen Anatomie*), who had erected for various monsters a number of so-called " genera " (each given a Latin generic name), including one named " Schistosomus ", to which various so-called " species " (each given a Latin trivial name) were referred, (2) by Eisenbarth (1908, *Wschr. Tierheilk. Viehz.*) in publishing a description of a monster under the so-called " specific name " *Schistosoma reflexum*, and (3) by Notter (1927, in Virchow's *Arch. f. path. Anat.*) who had followed the same practice in a paper entitled "*Schistosomen beim Schwein* " ;

(b) a note on the above case submitted by the Secretary in Point (8) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)19.

It was generally agreed that it was a misuse of the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature to apply it for the nomenclature of monsters. Such a use of the binominal system was particularly objectionable, when (as in the present case) one of the so-called generic names (*Schistosoma*) was identical with the name of a genus of the Animal Kingdom of great importance in an applied field of science (e.g. medicine). In this particular case, confusion had already arisen, the papers by Eisenbarth (1908) and Notter (1927) having appeared in a bibliography of Schistosomiasis.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that Latin names given to monsters possess no status in zoological nomenclature under the *Règles* and therefore that no name so given preoccupies a generic name under Article 34 or a trivial name under Article 35 ;

(2) to invite the attention of teratologists to the grave inconvenience and risk of confusion likely to arise through the use of the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature for the naming of monsters, with a view to securing their concurrence in the abandonment of this practice.

Applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature : cases published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " to have priority of consideration

11. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that the Commission should now direct their attention to the applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature, the texts of which had already been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The Parts of the *Bulletin* containing such applications were Parts 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Some considerable time had elapsed since the earlier of these applications had been published and members of the Commission had therefore had ample time to consider the issues involved.

THE COMMISSION approved the proposal submitted by the Acting President, as specified above.

Part 5 of Volume I of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " : consideration of applications published in

12. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 5 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing five applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature, in addition to fourteen applications relating to the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*, which had already been considered by the Commission at earlier meetings during their present Session.

THE COMMISSION :—

took note that three of the applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature included in Part 5 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* had been considered at the meeting noted in the margin, in order to suit the convenience of certain specialists attending the Section on Nomenclature, and agreed to consider forthwith the cases included in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin* on which decisions had not yet been taken.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session*, 12*th Meeting, Conclusions* 2, 8 *and* 9)

Oken, 1815-1816, "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte": status of new names published in

(*Previous reference: Paris Session*, 12*th Meeting, Conclusion* 9)

13. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at the meeting noted in the margin the Commission had agreed that the consideration of a proposal submitted by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) for the addition to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the names of three genera of the Order Carnivora (Class Mammalia) published by Brisson in 1762 in the *Regnum animale* should be postponed until after a decision had been taken by the Commission on the status of generic names published in that work. As explained in the note (file Z.N.(S.)177) which he (Commissioner Hemming) had published in regard to Dr. Stiles's proposal (Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**:112–113), Dr. Stiles had at the same time submitted a similar proposal in regard to the names of three genera belonging to the same Order which had first been published by Oken in 1815–1816 in his *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*. The names were of importance in human medicine, for parasites common to Man had been reported from species of each of the genera concerned. It was not possible however for the Commission to reach a decision on Dr. Stiles's proposals until they had first decided whether Oken's *Lehrbuch* was a work which complied with the requirements of proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (requirement that an author must in any given work have applied the principles of binominal (formerly "binary") nomenclature). An application for a ruling on the question of the availability of names first published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* had been submitted to the Commission (file Z.N.(S.)153) by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood, of Chicago, but had not yet been published in the *Bulletin*. This work contained new names in a wide range of groups in the Animal Kingdom and the new names in it had been accepted by workers in some groups and rejected by others. Doubt as to the status of names published in such a work was most undesirable and should be brought to an end as quickly as possible by an authoritative decision by the Commission. Dr. Osgood, who had been one of the foremost of American zoo-

logists in his forthright criticism of the slowness of the work of the Commission and, as it seemed to him, of the lack of vision and courage displayed by the Commission in the past, had expressed the view that the manner and spirit in which the Commission tackled the difficult problem presented by Oken's *Lehrbuch* would be looked upon by many zoologists as the touchstone of the capacity of the Commission to deal with difficult problems. From the point of view of reassuring progressive American zoologists regarding the capacity of the Commission to discharge impartially and effectively the duties entrusted to it, it was thus of importance, quite apart from other considerations, that an early decision should be taken by the Commission in this matter. The issues involved were however complicated and the consideration of this subject was rendered difficult by the fact that few zoological libraries contained a copy of Oken's *Lehrbuch*.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to take into consideration as soon as possible after the close of the present Session the application submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (U.S.A.) for a ruling on the availability under Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of names first published by Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* (file Z.N.(S.)153) ;

(2) to the Secretary to confer with specialists in the groups concerned on the question of the practice (whether acceptance or rejection) adopted in their respective groups in regard to the *Lehrbuch* names and to submit a Report thereon ;

(3) pending a decision on the question in (1) above, to defer a decision on the application submitted by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles for the addition to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the names of three genera of the Order Carnivora (Class Mammalia) first published by Oken in the work referred to in (1) above (file Z.N.(S.)177).

Geoffroy (E.L.), 1762, " Hist. Ins. Env." Paris : status of new names published in

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note (file Z.N.(S.)168) on the question of the availability under the *Règles* of generic names as first published by Geoffroy (E. L.) in 1762 in the work entitled *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1:117).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session*, 13*th Meeting, Conclusions* 8 *and* 9)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that the present belonged to the class of case, to which reference had been made in the discussion of the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), where, owing to the difficulty of the problem raised, a decision by the Commission had been inordinately delayed, for it was as far back as 1915 that this issue had been raised by Dr. J. M. Swaine (Department of Agriculture, Forest Investigations Branch, Ottawa, Canada) in connection with the name *Scolytus*. In addition, the same question had a year later (1916) been raised by Dr. A. D. Hopkins (Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.). No action was taken on those applications, and in its present form the question now before the Commission arose out of an application submitted by Professor H. B. Hungerford (U.S.A.) for a ruling in regard to the name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (file Z.N. (S.)147), which would be laid before the Commission as the next following item. Continuing, the Acting President said that the recommendation in regard to the interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " and the substitution therefor of the expression " nomenclature binominale " agreed upon by the Commission at the meeting noted in the margin and the subsequent approval of that recommendation by the Section on Nomenclature carried the present case a considerable step further forward. No one disputed that in the work in question Geoffroy had been a " binary " but not a binominal author. Accordingly, under the decision referred to above, new names published by that author in the *Histoire abrégée* did not satisfy the requirements of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 and in consequence were not available under the *Règles*. In reaching the foregoing decision in regard to Article 25, the Commission and the Section had agreed, however, that sympathetic consideration should be given to the question of validating the generic names in works rendered unavailable thereunder or to parts of such works, where it could be shown that it was in the interest of stability in nomenclature that names published in such works and at present in common use should be validated. It was therefore for the Commission to consider whether any, and, if so, what special action should be taken to validate generic names as first published by Geoffroy in 1762 in the work now under consideration.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

A CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION took place on the question whether availability should be given to all the generic names published in the *Histoire abérgée* or only to some of them. Some of these names should, it was agreed, certainly be preserved, but the position was not so clear as

regards others. It was felt that this was a subject which it would be better to deal with piecemeal, Order by Order, in the light of recommendations submitted by entomologists who were specialists in the Orders concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, having regard to the recommendation adopted at their Fourth Meeting (as noted in the margin) that the expression " nomenclature binominale " should be substituted for the expression " nomenclature binaire " in Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles* and to the subsequent approval of that recommendation by the Section on Nomenclature (at its First Meeting), names as published by Geoffroy (E. L.) in 1762 in the work entitled *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* were not available under the *Règles*, as Geoffroy had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature in that work, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25, as amended in the manner specified above ;

(2) that certain of the generic names published in the foregoing work, being in wide use, should certainly be validated in the interest of stability in nomenclature, but that, having regard to the large number of Orders of insects dealt with by Geoffroy in the foregoing work, it would be better to consider separately for each Order, in the light of advice from specialists in the Order concerned, the question whether some or all of the generic names published in the foregoing work should be rendered available rather than to render available *en bloc* all the generic names so published.

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission as soon as possible after the close of the present Session to arrange with specialists in the several Orders of insects concerned for the submission to the Commission of statements examining each of the generic names published for that Order by Geoffroy in the *Hist. abrég.* and containing proposals for the validation, under the plenary powers, of such of the names concerned, the rejection of which would lead to instability or confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, so that, in the light of the statements so received, the Commission may validate such of the names concerned as may appear to it to be appropriate and place the remainder on the

" Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above, reference being made at the same time to the decisions specified in (2) and (3) above.

" Corixa " Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) : validation of, and type species under the plenary powers

15. Arising out of the foregoing discussion, THE COMMISSION considered the problems relating to the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) which had been specifically raised by Professor H. B. Hungerford (file Z.N.(S.)137), the application regarding which had been published in Part 11 of Volume I of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Hungerford, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.***1** : 258-259). At the same time the Commission had under consideration a note on this application submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.***1** : 259).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the only letters which, as Secretary to the Commission, he had received in regard to this case, apart from that from Professor Hungerford, were from Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History)), who supported the validation of the name *Corixa* Geoffroy, and from Dr. G. A. Walton (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), who regarded that name as invalid, but had expressed himself as being anxious to see a final decision given in this matter. The question of the type species of this genus would not be of practical importance unless the Commission were to decide to use their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Corixa* as published by Geoffroy in 1762. It appeared to him (Commissioner Hemming) that, if the Commission were to take that line, their best course would be to use the same powers to designate *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, as the type species of this genus, as recommended by Professor Hungerford and Dr. China. This name was commonly treated as having been published in 1818, but, as shown by Sherborn (1926), it was in fact published in 1817.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to validate the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. Ins. Env. Paris* 1 : 478 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;

(b) to designate, as the type of the foregoing genus, the species *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **12**(**1**) : 17 ;

(2) to place the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (with the above species as its type species), on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*;

(3) to defer taking a decision on the question whether the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Corixa* Geoffroy should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* until after further consideration had been given to the question whether that name (*geoffroyi* Leach, 1817) was the oldest available trivial name for the species in question and to invite the Secretary to submit a Report on this subject as soon as possible after the close of the present Session;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

"Naucoris" Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera): question of validation of, under plenary powers to be considered

16. Arising out of the discussion on the question of the validation of generic names published by Geoffroy in his *Histoire abrégée* of 1762, recorded in Conclusion 14 above, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) brought before the Commission the question of the name *Naucoris* Geoffroy, 1762. Professor Usinger first proposed that this well-known name should be validated forthwith in the same way as the name *Corixa* Geoffroy had just been validated, but after further discussion he withdrew this proposal, being of the opinion that it would be better for this matter to be further considered by specialists before a decision was taken.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he felt also that this question should be deferred. He had had some correspondence with Dr. W. E. China in regard to this name, and he would prefer to have an opportunity of considering this case again before expressing an opinion on the action to be taken. He agreed however that it would be desirable to take a decision on this name as soon as was practicable.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) that consideration should be given, as soon as practicable after the close of the present Session, to the question whether the generic name *Naucoris* should be validated as from Geoffroy, 1762, in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) by the use of the Commission's plenary powers and, if so, what species should be selected as the type species of the genus so named;

(2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to submit a Report on the above matter as soon as possible after the close of the present Session.

" Buprestidae ", a pamphlet believed to have been written by F. W. Hope and distributed in 1836 : declared not published within the meaning of Article 25

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application submitted by the late Mr. H. J. Carter (file Z.N.(S.)57) that the Commission should give a ruling that the names which appeared in the pamphlet entitled " Buprestidae " privately and anonymously issued by Hope (F.W.) were not available under the *Règles*, those names not having been published (" divulgués dans une publication ") within the meaning of Article 25 (Carter, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 117–118) ;

(b) a note supporting the foregoing application submitted by President Karl Jordan (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 118).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, since the foregoing papers had been published, Mr. F. J. Griffin, the British bibliographer, had furnished additional material showing that this pamphlet had never been published, including a photograph of the first page of Hope's own copy, now preserved in the Hope Department of Entomology at the Oxford University Museum, on which Westwood (the first Hope Professor of Zoology) had himself written the word " unpublished ". From these indications there could be no doubt that this pamphlet had never been published within the meaning of Article 25. The evidence that publication had never taken place was so strong that it appeared to him (Commissioner Hemming) there was no need for the Commission to use their plenary powers in this case, it being sufficient to render an *Opinion* stating that this pamphlet had never been published within the meaning of the *Règles*. No objection had been lodged by any author against the course proposed, specialists concerned having, with the exception of Dr. J. Oldenberger of Prague, all rejected the new names in this pamphlet.

(*For the definition of the expression " divulgué dans une publication," see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the names contained in the anonymous pamphlet entitled " Buprestidae " believed (a) to have been written by F.W. Hope and (b) to have been distributed by that author in 1836 were not published (" divulgués dans une publication ") as prescribed by Article 25 and that they therefore had no standing under the *Règles* as from the date of distribution of that pamphlet ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above.

Part 8 of Volume I of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " : consideration of application published in

18. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 8 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 21 papers relating to 18 individual problems, of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine, in turn, each of the applications, the texts relating to which had been published in Part 8 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.*

Koch (C.L.), 1835-1842, " Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden " : definition of species eligible for selection as type species of genera first named in

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot (file Z.N.(S.)90) for a ruling in regard to the species to be accepted as the type species of certain genera in the Class Arachnida, for which diagnoses had first been published and type species designated (or selected) by Koch (C. L.) in 1842 in his *Übersicht des Arachnidensystems* but the names of which had previously been published by that author as components of the names of new species described by that author in his work *Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden* (Jacot, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 161). Dr. Jacot explained that between 1835 and 1842 Koch had described in the last-mentioned work a number of new species to which he had applied new generic names. In 1842 in the *Übersicht* he had given diagnoses for these genera and had figured one species of each. In an introductory note he had referred to the species so figured as " Typus dienend ". This note was accepted by most specialists as constituting a designation or selection of the species so figured to be the type species of the genera in question. Dr. Jacot had gone on to say that some specialists had questioned the propriety of this view, arguing that the type species of the genera in question should be looked for not in the *Übersicht* of 1842 but in the *Hefte* of the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* in which those names had first appeared. Dr. Jacot had taken the view that to go back to the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* in this way " hardly seems consistent with the author's idea or with customary usage." He had therefore asked the Commission to give a ruling on this question.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that many years ago the Commission had dealt (in *Opinion* 30) with a somewhat similar case which had been concerned with certain generic names in the Class Aves published by Swainson in a paper on Mexican birds which had accidentally appeared before the paper (at the same time in the press) in which Swainson had given

diagnoses for these genera and had designated type species for them. In that case the Commission had ruled that the generic names in question were available as from the date on which they were published as the generic components of the names of new Mexican birds and that, where one species only was cited under one of these new names, that species was automatically the type species of the genus concerned by monotypy. In the present case, therefore, it must be accepted that, when Koch had published new generic names in this manner in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen*, the generic names in question were available under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published. Thus where in that work Koch applied a new generic name to one species only on the occasion on which that name was first published, that species was automatically the type species by monotypy; similarly, where on that occasion he applied that generic name to two or more species (as in the case of the generic name *Hoplophora*) those species alone were eligible for selection at a later date as the type species of the genus concerned. In this connection, it was important to remember that, at the meetings noted in the margin, the Commission had agreed during the present Session to recommend that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the method to be followed in determining the date of publication of a given book or part of a book and directing also that the expression " le plus anciennement designé ", as used in Article 25, was to be interpreted rigorously. Accordingly, it must be realised in the present case that the only species which could be accepted as originally included species of a genus established by Koch in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* was, or were, the species cited under that generic name in the *Heft* of that work in which that generic name first appeared or, if that name appeared in two or more *Hefte* published simultaneously, in those *Hefte*. Turning to the statement made by Koch in the introduction to the volume of his *Übersicht* published in 1842, the Acting President said that some specialists by whom this matter had been considered had been doubtful whether in using the phrase " Typus dienend " Koch had intended to refer to the concept of a " type species of a genus." It might well be that, as had been suggested, Koch had used this phrase to indicate that he regarded the species which he figured as a typical representative of the genus rather than as its type species in the nomenclatorial sense. It was not possible—or appropriate—in a code of law to seek to interpret what was in the mind of a given author when making a particular statement. All that could properly be done was to look at the words which he had used and to determine what on a strict interpretation was

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 18; *9th Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

the meaning applicable to them. Judged by this objective test, the statement made by Koch appeared to him (the Acting President) to satisfy the requirements in Rule (g) in Article 30. Even, however, if one thus granted that, in making that statement, Koch had made type selections under the foregoing Rule, it did not follow that the selection so made was a valid one, for this would be the case only (1) if the genus in question was not monotypical, when first published in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* and did not contain a species having as a trivial name either the word *typus* or the word *typicus* or a word which was tautonymous with the generic name, and (2) if the species selected in the *Übersicht* was one of the species originally included in the genus on the occasion when the name in question had been first published in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen*. Dr. Jacot had not given particulars regarding the generic names covered by his application and in the absence of such particulars, it was not possible to determine whether the application of the *Règles* to those names would lead to confusion or not. If, after examining the position as regards any of the names in question, any specialist were to be of the opinion that the strict application of the *Règles* in that case would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, it would be possible for him to submit to the Commission a statement setting out the facts of the case, with a request that the Commission should use their plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus concerned some species, the designation as such of which was in harmony with current practice and would prevent confusion from occurring.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, in accordance with the principle illustrated by the decision given by the Commission in *Opinion* 30, the generic names published for the first time by Koch (C. L.) in *Hefte* of the work *Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden* during the period 1835–1842, when forming new specific names for previously unnamed species are available as from the date of being so published and the type species of a such a genus is determined under Rules (b), (c) and (d) in Article 30, where, as the case may be, an originally included species (i) bears the trivial name *typus* or *typicus*, or (ii) is the sole species so included, or (iii) bears a trivial name which is tautonymous with the generic name and in other cases under Rule (g) in that Article ;

(2) that the reference in the last paragraph of the "Vorwort" to the *Erste Abt eilung* of the third volume (*Drittes Heft*) of the *Übersicht des Arachnidensystems* (published in 1842) to the single species figured in that volume for each genus as "Typus dienend" is to be accepted as constituting a selection of that species to be the type species of that genus under Rule (g) in Article 30;

(3) that, in the case of a genus, the name of which was first published in the *Deutschlands Crustaceen*, the type selection made for that genus by Koch in the *Übersicht* in the manner specified in (2) above is a valid selection only (a) when the genus in question was not monotypical at the time when it was first named and did not contain a species having as a trivial name either the word *typus* or the word *typicus* or a word which was tautonymous with the generic name, and (b) when the species so selected was one of the species referred to the genus in the *Heft* of the *Deutschlands Crustaceen* in which the generic name was first published or, where two or more *Hefte* were published simultaneously and the generic name appeared in more than one of these *Hefte*, one of the species so referred in any of these *Hefte;*

(4) that if, on applying the foregoing decisions, specialists are of the opinion that the adoption as the type species of any given genus of the species so determined as such would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, it was open to those specialists to submit an application to the Commission for the use of the plenary powers and the Commission, on receiving such an application supported by adequate particulars relating to the name in question and the grounds on which instability and confusion was apprehended, could then judge whether or not the plenary powers should be used to vary the type species of the genus in question;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above, reference being made at the same time to the decision recorded in (4) above.

"Diaptomus vulgaris" Schmeil, 1897 (Class Crustacea,

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. Robert Gurney (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)8) on the question of the oldest

Order Copepoda) : Validation, under the plenary powers of the trivial name " vulgaris "

available trivial name for the species renamed *Diaptomus vulgaris* by Schmeil in 1897 (Class Crustacea, Order Copepoda) (Gurney, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 162). The above name had been given by Schmeil as a name for the species of Copepod to which Fischer (1853) had applied the name *Cyclopsina coerulea*. That name would have been an available name if it had been given as a new name, but unfortunately Fischer had made it clear that the trivial name *coerulea* was not a new name but was the same name as that used by O. F. Müller in 1785, when he published the then new name *Cyclops coeruleus*. Müller's species was generally regarded by modern workers as unidentifiable, although one worker claimed to have established such an identification. Accordingly it remained a matter of continual doubt whether Müller's name *coeruleus* could be correctly applied to the species to which Schmeil had later given the trivial name *vulgaris*. It was to resolve this difficulty that the present application had been submitted to the Commission.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present was a case which fell within the class of case for which, at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had recommended an extension of their plenary powers. There was no question here of confusion arising through the strict application of the *Règles*. The confusion involved was of a different kind, arising through the impossibility of determining how the *Règles* should be applied. He recommended that the Commission should dispose of the difficulty in the present case by suppressing the name published by Müller in 1785 as unrecognisable, and validating the name (*Diaptomus vulgaris*) published by Schmeil in 1897, that name being not only fully documented but also the name generally (though not universally) in use for this species.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the trivial name *coeruleus* Müller (O.F.), 1785 (as published in the binominal combination *Cyclops coeruleus*) for the purposes of Article 25, but not for those of Article 35 ;

(b) to validate the trivial name *vulgaris* Schmeil, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Diaptomus vulgaris*) for the species of the Order Copepoda (Class Crustacea) so named ;

(2) to put the trivial name *vulgaris* Schmeil, 1897 (as published in the binominal combination *Diaptomus vulgaris*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and the trivial name *coeruleus* Müller (O.F.), 1785 (as published in the binominal combination *Cyclops coeruleus*) on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

The generic name " Graptolithus " Linnaeus, 1768 and the specific name " Graptolithus scalaris " Linnaeus, 1768 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) : suppression of, under the plenary powers

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. O. M. B. Bulman (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)11) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suppress the name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768, as a generic name and the name *Graptolithus scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768, as a specific name, having regard to the fact (a) that Linnaeus himself regarded these names as applying to inorganic matter and (2) that the name *scalaris* was now regarded as probably applying to a Graptolite, but that it could not be identified with certainty and thus remained a menace to stability in graptolite nomenclature, as long as it possessed availability under the *Règles* (Bulman, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 163–164).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to suppress for purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34 or, as the case might be, Article 35 :—

(a) the generic name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768 (Class Graptolithina) ;

(b) the trivial name *scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Graptolithus scalaris*) ;

(2) to place the name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768, on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " and the trivial name *scalaris* Linnaeus, 1768 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Graptolithus scalaris*) on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Monograptus (emend. of " Monograpsus ") Geinitz, 1852 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) : validation of, under the plenary powers

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. O. M. B. Bulman (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)11) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Monograptus* (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852, with *Lomatoceras priodon* Bronn, 1834, as its type species, and for this purpose to suppress the generic names *Lomatoceras* Bronn, 1834, and *Monoprion* Barrande, 1850 (Bulman, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 164–166). The name *Monograptus* had been in continuous use for nearly 80 years, and was extensively employed in stratigraphical literature, being probably the most important and widely distributed single graptolite genus. Great confusion, unaccompanied by any corresponding advantage, would result from the rejection of the name *Monograptus* on purely nomenclatorial grounds.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the generic names *Lomatoceras* Bronn, 1834, and *Monoprion* Barrande, 1850, for the purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34 ;

(b) to validate the generic name *Monograptus* (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852, with *Lomatoceras priodon* Bronn, 1834, as its type species ;

(2) to place the generic name *Monograptus* Geinitz, 1852 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea), emended and validated as above and with the above species as its type species, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the trivial name *priodon* Bronn, 1834 (as published in the binominal combination *Lomatoceras priodon*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the generic names *Lomatoceras* Bronn, 1834, and *Monoprion* Barrande, 1850, on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Retiolites " Barrande, 1850 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) : validation of, under the plenary powers

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. O. M. B. Bulman (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)11) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850, by suppressing the name *Gladiolites* Barrande, 1850 (Bulman, 1946, *Bull. zool.*

Nomencl., **1**: 166). It was explained that Barrande, when proposing the latter of these names, had thought that objection might be taken to it on the ground that it was too near to the generic name *Gladiolus* in plants and had accordingly at the same time published the name *Retiolites* as an alternative name for this genus. The name *Gladiolites* had not since been used for graptolites, its place having been taken by *Retiolites*. The latter was widely used in stratigraphy, the "Retiolites Shale" being a well-known, long-established and important stratigraphical unit in the Upper Silurian of Sweden, extensively quoted not only in Scandinavian literature but also in correlation with Europe and America. Further the name *Retiolites* figured in nearly every elementary textbook of palaeontology and stratigraphy.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the generic name *Gladiolites* Barrande, 1850, for the purposes of Article 25 but not for those of Article 34;

(b) to validate the generic name *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850, with *Gladiolites geinitzianus* Barrande, 1850, as type species;

(2) to place the generic name *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea), validated as above and with the above species as its type species, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(3) to place the generic name *Gladiolites* Barrande, 1850, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology";

(4) to place the trivial name *geinitzianus* Barrande, 1850 (as published in the binominal combination *Gladiolites geinitzianus*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

"Diplodinium" Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora): trivial name of type species of

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application submitted by the late Professor C. A. Kofoid (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)13) for a ruling regarding the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora) (Kofoid, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 167);

(b) a note on the foregoing application submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 168);

(c) an extract from a letter addressed to the Secretary to the Commission by Professor Harold Kirby giving certain additional information asked for by Secretary Hemming (Kirby, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 169–170).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that, at the time when Professor Kofoid first submitted this application to the Commission (i.e. in 1930), he accepted as probably correct the conclusion reached by Eberlein (1895) that Schuberg was in error when he identified with *Entodinium dentatum* Stein, 1858, the species on which he based his genus *Diplodinium*. Later, however, in his monograph (written jointly with MacLennan) (1932), Professor Kofoid had given grounds for believing that no error of identification had been made by Schuberg and that Eberlein himself had been in error in disputing Schuberg's identification. This view was shared also by Wertheim (1935) and, as the Commission would see, by Professor Kirby. In these circumstances all difficulty in this case disappeared.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that it was no longer considered by specialists in the group concerned that Schuberg (1888) was in error when he identified with *Entodinium dentatum* Stein, 1858, the species placed by him under this name in the genus *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora) ;

(2) agreed that, in view of (1) above, the type species of the foregoing genus was correctly cited by Schuberg under the trivial name *dentatum* (as originally published by Stein in 1858 in the binominal combination *Entodinium dentatum*) ;

(3) agreed :—

(a) to place the generic name *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (type species by monotypy : *Entodinium dentatum* Stein, 1858, as determined by Schuberg (1888), by Kofoid and MacLennan (1932) and by Wertheim (1935)), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(b) to place the trivial name *dentatum* Stein, 1858 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Entodinium dentatum* and as identified by the authors specified in (a) above) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Aspidoproctus " Newstead, [April] 1901 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) (a generic name published for a single species but at the same time rejected by its author as not needed for that species) : addition of, to " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)46) for a ruling on the question whether a manuscript generic name (*Aspidoproctus*) published by an author (Newstead) on a given date (1901) for a given species but rejected in the same paper as being unnecessary is available, if later it is considered on taxonomic grounds that the species for which it was so published (but to which it was not actually applied except in synonymy) requires a separate generic name (Cockerell, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 171).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, at their meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had agreed to incorporate in the *Règles* the ruling given in *Opinion* 4 on the subject of the availability of manuscript names, when published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of the provisos to Article 25. From that decision it followed that the generic name *Aspidoproctus* Newstead ranked for purposes of priority from April, 1901, the date when it was first published by Newstead. The type species of the genus *Aspidoproctus* was *Walkeriana pertinax* Newstead, April, 1901, that being the sole species in connection with which the generic name *Aspidoproctus* had then been published.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, in accordance with the ruling given in *Opinion* 4 and now to be embodied in the *Règles*, the generic name *Aspidoproctus* published by Newstead in April, 1901, as a rejected manuscript name was available under Article 25 as from the date of being so published, and accordingly had priority over the name *Lophococcus* Cockerell, [August] 1901 ;

(2) that *Walkeriana pertinax* Newstead, 1901, was the type species of the genus *Aspidoproctus* Newstead, 1901, by monotypy, that being the sole species at that time cited in connection with this generic name ;

(3) to place :—

(a) the generic name *Aspidoproctus* Newstead, [April] 1901 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), with the above species as its type species, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(b) the trivial name *pertinax* Newstead, 1901 (as published in the binominal combination *Walkeriana pertinax*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Article 25 : a specific name based upon a specimen which is undescribed but which formed part of the type series of a previously described species, declared not to satisfy Proviso (a)

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Dr. J. M. Aldrich (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)103) for a ruling on the question whether (a) a specific name based upon a single specimen of a previously named and described species, and (b) a generic name based upon such a specific name, have any availability under the *Règles*, when no characters are given for the species or genus so named, other than that the type specimen of the species was one of the specimens included in error by a previous author among the type material of another species described by that author (Aldrich, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 171). Dr. Aldrich had illustrated the problem which he had submitted by citing the case of the nominal species *Phoranthella morrisoni* Townsend, 1915 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) and the generic name *Phoranthella* then published by Townsend for the first time. The above species was designated by Townsend as the type species of the genus *Phoranthella* and accordingly the generic name *Phoranthella* would be an available name, if the name of the nominal species *Phoranthella morrisoni* Townsend could be regarded as an available name. But the only statement made by its author in regard to this species was that it was based upon one specified example of the type series of another species described by a different author (*Phorantha* (*Hyalomyia*) *occidentis* Coquillet, 1897). Dr. Aldrich had observed that Coquillet's series of *occidentis* consisted of some 40 specimens from 12 localities, and that Townsend had taken out only one specimen as misidentified ; no description of *Phoranthella morrisoni* had been published by Townsend or Coquillet.

It was pointed out that under the ruling in *Opinion* 1 in no case could a museum label or specimen be accepted as an " indication " and therefore that the name *Phoranthella morrisoni* could not be regarded as having been accompanied by an " indication " at the time when it was first published (1915). As at that date, therefore, the above name was a *nomen nudum*. It followed that, as at 1915, the generic name *Phoranthella* was also a *nomen nudum*, for its identity turned solely upon the status of the nominal species designated as its type species.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, as published by Townsend in 1915, the specific name *Phoranthella morrisoni* (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), was a *nomen nudum*, and consequently, as at that date, the generic name *Phoranthella* Townsend, 1915, which depended for its recognition solely upon the status of the name of its type species, was also a *nomen nudum;*

(2) that the name *Phoranthella* Townsend, 1915, should be added to the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " and that the trivial name *morrisoni* Townsend, 1915 (as published in the binominal combination *Phoranthella morrisoni*), should be added to the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ".

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Diadema " Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) : validation of, under the plenary powers

27. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) (file Z.N.(S.)52) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to preserve the generic name *Diadema* in its accustomed sense in the Class Echinoidea (Mortensen, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 172–175).

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(*Later reference : Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 32)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that the present application had originally been submitted to them by Dr. Mortensen as long ago as 1932, after an extensive sounding of opinion among interested specialists had shown a strong desire, on the part of the great majority of those concerned, to secure the continued use in its accustomed sense of the generic name *Diadema*, the disappearance of which in synonymy would give rise to serious confusion. Preliminary consideration had been given to this matter by the Commission during their Lisbon Session in 1935, when it had been pointed out that the name *Diadema* had been published as a generic name on two occasions (by Schumacher in 1817 and by Ranzani in the same year) prior to its use in the Phylum Echinodermata by Gray in 1825. It had in consequence been agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, that the consideration of this application should be deferred and that Dr. Mortensen should be invited to confer with himself (Commissioner Hemming) with a view to the submission to the Commission of the data required to enable a decision to be reached. The paper referred to above, which had been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, was the outcome of those discussions. In that paper it was

suggested that the Commission should use their plenary powers to validate the name *Diadema* (with *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778, as type species) as from Humphreys (1797, *Mus. calonn.*), notwithstanding the fact that in *Opinion* 51 the Commission had ruled against the availability of names published in that work. It had since been ascertained from Professor Hj. Broch (Oslo) that not only was the generic name *Diadema* Schumacher not in use for a Cirripede but that it would, in his opinion, lead to confusion if such a change were to be necessary, which fortunately was not the case. Continuing, the Acting President said that he had had an opportunity of a further discussion of this case with Dr. Mortensen during a visit which he had paid to Copenhagen during the previous year (1947). As a result, Dr. Mortensen and he had agreed to amend the proposal submitted to the Commission by substituting for it a proposal that the name *Diadema* Schumacher, 1817, and the name *Diadema* Ranzani (if that name was in fact distinct from that published by Schumacher) should be suppressed and that the name *Diadema* should be validated in the Class Echinoidea as from Gray, 1825, the author and date to which that name was commonly attributed, the type species of this genus to be, as previously proposed, *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778.

Since the Lisbon Session the application for the use of the plenary powers in this case had been advertised but that advertisement had not disclosed any information not known as the result of the sounding of opinion among interested specialists carried out by Dr. Mortensen, prior to the submission by him of his original proposal in 1932. Dr. Hubert Lyman Clark (Harvard University) had renewed his former objections, while Dr. Austin H. Clark (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had reaffirmed his support for the action proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to suppress the names *Diadema* Schumacher, 1817, and *Diadema* Ranzani, 1817 (Class Crustacea, Sub-Class Cirripedia) ;

  (b) to validate the name *Diadema* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) with *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778, as type species ;

(2) to place the generic name *Diadema* Gray, 1825, validated as above and with the above species as its type species on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the generic names *Diadema* Schumacher, 1817, and *Diadema* Ranzani, 1817, on the " Official

Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" ;

(4) to place the trivial name *setosa* Leske, 1778 (as originally published in the binominal combination *Echinometra setosa*), on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

Orders and Higher Taxonomic Units : problem of obtaining uniformity in nomenclature of

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request received from the late Mr. Edwin Ashby (file Z.N.(S.)20) for a ruling on the question of the relative merits of the names Polyplacophora and Loricata as the name for the Class known as " Chitons " in the Phylum Mollusca (Ashby, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 176).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested as the question here at issue was the regulation of names of taxonomic units above the family level, it would be convenient if, while considering the problem submitted by the late Mr. Ashby, the Commission were to consider also the application for a ruling on the relative merits of the names Bryozoa and Polyzoa for the Class universally known by one or other of these names submitted by Sir Sidney Harmer (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)72), through the late Dr. W. L. Sclater, on behalf of the " Zoological Record Committee " of the Zoological Society of London (Harmer, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 230–231).

IN THE COURSE OF A GENERAL DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was anomalous that zoologists should have taken so much pains, first by the adoption of the *Règles*, and second, by the grant of special powers to the International Commission, to promote uniformity in nomenclature up to the family level but should have done nothing to secure a similar object for the great categories represented by Orders, Classes and Phyla. The reason was, no doubt, that, at the time when the *Règles* were established, the task of grappling with the problems involved in nomenclature up to the family level were such as to leave zoologists with insufficient energy to tackle the problem of the nomenclature of the higher categories. There were naturally zoologists who were such narrow specialists that they saw no harm in the same word being used to denote (for example) Orders in two different Classes in the Animal Kingdom, but to zoologists of wider outlook, particularly to University and other teachers of zoology, the present situation was highly unsatisfactory, being both illogical and calculated to cause confusion. The question had been raised some years before the war at a meeting of the American Association for the

Advancement of Science but no practical suggestions had then been formulated. Undoubtedly, zoologists in general were becoming increasingly tired of the state of disorder which still reigned in this field of zoological nomenclature, and it was natural therefore that such zoologists or groups of zoologists should turn to the Commission for guidance, as first the late Mr. Ashby had done, and later the Zoological Record Committee of the Zoological Society of London. On the other hand the problems involved were essentially difficult and great care would be necessary in the choice of an approach to the subject. It was generally felt that, however disappointing a further delay might be to those who were interested to secure some progress in this field or even to obtain some guidance in particular cases, the best course would be to avoid expressing any piecemeal opinion in this matter. The best hope lay in carrying out first a thorough examination of the whole field in conjunction with interested specialists.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that Commissioner Francis Hemming (Secretary to the Commission) should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems involved in securing uniformity in the nomenclature of categories down to, and including, the Categories Order (*Ordo*) and Sub-Order (*Sub-Ordo*), and to submit a comprehensive Report thereon, with recommendations, to the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of recommendations for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject ;

(2) in view of (1) above, to defer decisions on the applications received for advice on the relative merits of :—

(a) the Class Names Polyplacophora and Loricata in the Phylum Mollusca ;

(b) the Class Names Bryozoa and Polyzoa.

***Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea), a composite nominal species : action by Braun in determining taxonomic identity of, correct under Article 31**

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. G. Witenberg (Hebrew University, Jerusalem) (file Z.N.(S.)126) asking for a ruling on the question whether Braun, on discovering that the original vial containing specimens determined by Rudolphi as *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) contained two species, acted in accordance with

the *Règles* when he selected one of those species to be the species to which the foregoing name should adhere (Witenberg, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 176).

In the discussion on this application it was pointed out that, whatever doubt might have existed at the time when Dr. Witenberg submitted the present application to the Commission, there was now no doubt at all regarding the validity of the action taken by Braun in this case, for that action was in strict conformity with the procedure to be laid down in Article 31, when amended in accordance with the recommendations agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin held during the present Session.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that Braun (1901) had acted in strict conformity with Article 31 of the *Règles* when, on ascertaining, by reference to Rudolphi's original material of *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea), that that species was a composite species containing two taxonomically distinct species, he had selected one of those species to be the species to which the name *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803, should adhere ;

(2) that the trivial name *ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Fasciola ovata*), as determined by Braun (1901), should be placed on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Petalifera Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda, Order Aplysiomorpha) : relative status of

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam) (file Z.N.(S.)150) regarding the relative status of the names *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda, Order Aplysiomorpha) (Engel, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 177).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that this was one of the oldest of the outstanding cases which had been transferred to him by his predecessor, it having been submitted to the Commission by Dr. Engel as far back as 1933. He was therefore most anxious that a decision on it should, if possible, be reached at the present Session. At the time when this application was submitted, the name *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, was in general use for *Aplysia petalifera* Rang, 1828

its type species, though in 1896 Pilsbry had sunk this generic name as a synonym of *Petalifera* Gray, 1847 (type species, by absolute tautonymy : *Aplysia petalifera* Rang, 1828). The latter name had, however, been published by Gray in a most irregular manner as a synonym of a new genus (*Dolabrifera*) then established by himself for the first time. At their meeting noted in the margin the Commission had agreed to defer for further study the question of the species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established in a generic synonymy. It might be argued however that in spite of the defective manner in which the name *Petalifera* Gray had been first published, there could be no doubt as to its type species, that having been designated by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) in Article 30 ; and that the generic name *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, satisfied all the requirements of Article 25, for even before the liberalisation of the definition of the expression " indication " agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, this name had been published with an " indication," as then defined in *Opinion* 1, for it had been published with an indicated type species. The only question which remained to be considered was whether greater confusion than uniformity was likely to result through the digging-up of this long-forgotten name. On the evidence submitted, it had appeared that this was probable, but through the slowness of the action of the Commission it was possible that the position might have changed and that now the best course would be to let the *Règles* take their course.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 37).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 13).

THE VIEW WAS EXPRESSED that, for reasons explained by the Acting President, it was desirable that a decision should be reached on this case as soon as possible. On the other hand, it was important that the inquiry to which the Acting President had referred should not be in any way prejudged. It was further felt that before a decision was taken, it was desirable that information should be obtained from interested specialists on the question whether, if it were found that the name *Petalifera* Gray 1847, were an available name and therefore that that name should be substituted for the name *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, that substitution would be likely to cause greater confusion than uniformity. In the light of the information so obtained, it would be possible both to meet the wishes of specialists and to avoid prejudging the question of principle involved, by the use *ad hoc* of the plenary powers, in so far as might be necessary. If the consensus of opinion were to show that no serious confusion was to be apprehended, the Commission could then settle the present case by placing

the name *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the name *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology". If, on the other hand, the proposed consultation were to show that the substitution of names indicated above would be likely to cause confusion, it would be open to the Commission to preserve the generic name *Aplysiella* Fischer as against the older name *Petalifera* Gray.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to ascertain from interested specialists whether, if *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, were found to be an available name, the substitution of that name for *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872, which would then be necessary, would be likely to give rise to greater confusion than uniformity ;

(2) to take a final decision and render an *Opinion* on the present application as quickly as possible after the information asked for in (1) above was available.

Acme Hartmann, 1821, _Acmea_ Hartmann, 1821, and _Acmaea_ Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda) ; relationship of these names to one another under Article 34.

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)27) submitted by Mrs. Avery R. Test (formerly Avery R. Grant) (University of California, Berkeley, U.S.A.) for a ruling on the question whether the name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) was to be treated as a homonym of *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821 (there treated as an emendation by Hartmann of the name *Acme* Hartmann published in the same year) (Class Gastropoda, Order Mesogastropoda) (Test, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 178–180).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, since Mrs. Test's application had been published in the *Bulletin*, he had received a detailed communication on this case from Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.). This communication threw a new light on this case and presented data which differed in important respects from the information previously available to the Commission. The most important point of difference made by Mr. Baily was that *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, was not (as many authors, including Mrs. Test in her application to the Commission, had considered) an emendation by Hartmann of his own name *Acme* Hartmann published in the same year, but had in fact been given by Hartmann to a different genus. Further, evidence was advanced by Mr. Baily to show

that the *Neue Alpina* in which the name *Acmea* Hartmann first appeared was actually published earlier in 1821 than the portion (Heft 5) of volume 6 of Sturm's *Deutschland's Fauna* in which the name *Acme* Hartmann first appeared. There were therefore three (and not merely two) generic names to consider :—(1) *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda), a well-established name in universal use which all interested specialists were agreed should, if possible, be preserved ; (2) *Acme* Hartmann, 1821, originally described on page 37 of Heft 5 of Vol. 6 of Sturm's *Deutschland's Fauna* without included species, and in 1822 used by Hartmann (*ibid.* 6 (Heft 6) : 61), for *Bulimus lineatus* Draparnaud, 1801, in place of *Acicula* Hartmann, 1821, an invalid homonym (*Acme* Hartmann, 1821, was stated by Mr. Baily to be in general use, though he pointed out that some authors (but not he himself) had rejected it on the ground of its similarity to *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833.) ; (3) *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, had, it appeared, never been in popular use, the genus concerned having been consistently known by the name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, until Iredale in 1915 had drawn attention to the earlier name.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions* 41)

Continuing, the Acting President recalled that, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been decided to recommend a clarification of Article 34, which would put an end to all doubts as to the circumstances in which two similar but not identical generic names were to be regarded as homonyms of one another. That decision affected the present case in two ways : (1) It was now clear that neither the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, nor the name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, was a homonym of *Acme* Hartmann, 1821 ; (2) the names *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, were to be regarded as homonyms of one another only if it was " evident " that they were based upon the same Latin or Latinised word. On this latter question, extensive data had been advanced in the papers submitted to show that the words of which these two names were composed—which were admittedly Latinised Greek words—were entirely distinct from one another and possessed quite different meanings. In these circumstances, it was not " evident " that these two names were based upon the same word. Accordingly, *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, were not to be regarded as homonyms of one another. This was satisfactory, in that it enabled the strong general desire of specialists that the well-known generic name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz should be preserved to be realised. On the other hand, it could not be disputed that the concurrent existence within a single Class (the Class Gastropoda) of two generic names differing from one another

by so little as did the names *Acmea* and *Acmaea* was calculated to give rise to confusion. For this reason, there seemed to the Acting President to be good reason to use the plenary powers to suppress the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, the separate existence of which as a generic name had had only recently been brought to light by the bibliographical investigations conducted by Mr. Baily. Moreover, this course had the further important advantage that it would validate the well-known and universally-accepted name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, which otherwise would fall to the resurrected name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821.

IN DISCUSSION, it was generally agreed that a solution of the long-standing difficulties associated with these names ought to be found with as little further delay as possible, and the hope was expressed that the suggestion which had been put forward would provide the ground for such a settlement. The case in favour of using the plenary powers to suppress the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, was a strong one, for not only would that action eliminate all possibility of confusion arising from the use of the later name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, but it would also provide a means for preserving the long-established name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, which otherwise would fall a victim to *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, the separate existence of which, as a generic name, had only just been established. It was desirable that the suggested solution should be put to specialists as quickly as possible with a view to early action by the Commission and the issue of an *Opinion* as soon as the desires of the specialists concerned had been ascertained.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1). that the generic name *Acme* Hartmann, 1821 (type species, by monotypy : *Bulimus lineatus* Draparnaud, 1801), was an available name in the sense that it was not a homonym of any previously published generic name, and further that no evidence had been adduced which would justify the emendation, under Article 19, of this name from *Acme* to *Acmea* ;

(2) that, under the clarification of Article 34 agreed upon during the present Session, the undermentioned generic names were not to be regarded as homonyms of one another :—

(*a*) *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821 (type species, by selection by Iredale, 1915) : *Acmea truncata* Hartmann, 1821 (= *Cyclostoma truncatulum* Draparnaud, 1801) (Class Gastropoda, Order Mesogastropoda) ;

(*b*) *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833 (type species, by selection by Dall, 1871 : *Acmaea mitra* Eschscholtz, 1833) (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) ;

(3) that, in view of likelihood of continued confusion if two such similar names as *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, were both used in a single Class (Class Gastropoda) and having regard also to the strong objection to which the substitution of the unknown name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, for the well-known and long-established

name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, would be open, specialists should be asked to express their opinion on the proposal that the plenary powers should be used to suppress the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, thereby eliminating all possibility of confusion arising from the use of the name *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, and at the same time validating the name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, while the third genus concerned (of which *Bulimus lineatus* Draparnaud, 1801, is the type species) would be known by its valid name *Acme* Hartmann, 1821 ;

(4) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to re-submit this case as soon as the inquiry instituted under (3) above had been completed ;

(5) to reach a decision on this case, and to render an *Opinion* thereon, as quickly as possible after the receipt of the Report asked for in (4) above, the case in the meantime to be regarded as *sub judice* and the name *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, not to be replaced by the name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821.

" Ammonites cordatus " Sowerby, 1813 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) : designation of a lectotype under the plenary powers.

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application submitted by Dr. W. J. Arkell (then of the University Museum, Oxford) (file Z.N.(S)58) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers for the purpose of setting aside the selection by Miss M. Healey (1905) of fig. 2 on pl. 17 of vol. 1. of Sowerby's *Min. Conch. Great Britain* as the lectotype of *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, 1813, and of designating in its place fig. 4 on the same plate (Arkell, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 181–184, 1 pl.) ;

(*b*) a note by the Secretary to the Commission on the scope of the proposal submitted by Dr.Arkell (Hemming, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 185).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) pointed out that a large part of Dr. Arkell's case rested upon the fact that *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, as identified with Sowerby's figure 4, was an important index fossil, giving its name to the " Cordatus Zone " of the Jurassic. It fell therefore in the class of case which the Commission had agreed at the meeting noted in the margin called for specially sympathetic consideration. It was clearly most important that the names of zone fossils of importance in stratigraphy should not lightly be changed for reasons of a purely technical nomenclatorial character. In the present case Dr. Arkell argued that great confusion would arise if Miss Healey's selection of Sowerby's fig. 2 to be the lectotype were to be upheld ; it would involve the disappearance of the term " Cordatus Zone " which everybody knew and which was moreover adopted by, amongst many others, Roman (1938) in his monumental *Ammonites jurassiques et crétacés*, and the substitution for that term of the expression " Subcordatum Zone ", for the term " Cardia Zone " adopted by Buckman and Spath in place

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

of "Cordatus Zone" was in any event incorrect. Continuing, the Acting President said that he had received two further communications in regard to this case, the first from Dr. L. F. Spath (British Museum (Natural History), London) objecting to the grant of the present application, the second, from Dr. J. Brookes Knight, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, reporting that by a vote of six (Romer, Newell, Cooper, Moore, Keen, and Knight) to five (Simpson, Wells, Palmer, Frizzell, and Reeside), with one abstention (Stenzel) the Committee had voted in favour of the adoption of Dr. Arkell's proposal. In forwarding this communication, Dr. Knight had stated that, in view of the closeness of the voting, the Joint Committee did not feel justified in taking a stand, but it passed on to the Commission the resolution and the record of the vote for what it was worth as a contribution to the Commission's study of the case. The Acting President added that, prior to the present Session, it would have been difficult to deal with Dr. Arkell's application, for up till then the Article (Article 31) which dealt with the determination of the type specimen of a composite nominal species was obscure and inadequate. Moreover, up till then, the expression "lectotype" itself did not figure in the *Règles*. Both these defects had however been remedied by decisions taken during the present Session.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11 ; *6th Meeting, Conclusion* 75)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside all selections of a lectotype for *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby 1813 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) made prior to the present decision ;

(b) to designate figure 4 on plate 17 of volume 1 of Sowerby's *Mineral Conchology of Great Britain*, published in 1813, to be the lectotype of *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, 1813 ;

(2) to place the trivial name *cordatus* Sowerby, 1813 (as published in the binominal combination *Ammonites cordatus*), determined as specified in (1) (b) above, on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

"Actinote" Hübner, [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera): designation of type

33. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)63) submitted jointly by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) and Mr.

species of, under the plenary powers.

N. D. Riley (British Museum (National History) London), asking for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers for the purpose of designating *Papilio thalia* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Actinote* Hübner, (1819) (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (Hemming and Riley, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 186–187).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), said that the present application, which had been submitted by Mr. Riley and himself as specialists in the Order Lepidoptera, was concerned to prevent the confusion which would arise it if were necessary to accept as the type species of the genus *Actinote* Hübner not the species intended by the original author of the genus (a species of the subfamily ACRAEINAE of the family NYMPHALIDAE) but the species (of the subfamily NYMPHALINAE) to which the name of the type species properly applied. The present was therefore a case of a genus having as its type species an erroneously determined species, and, as such, was submitted to the Commission in accordance with the invitation given by the Commission when taking the decision later embodied in their *Opinion* 168, a decision which at the meeting noted in the margin held during the present Session was now to be incorporated in the *Règles*. No objection had been received from any source in regard to the action proposed in this case.

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 38)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that this case was of special importance, for the strict application of the *Règles* thereto would not only cause great confusion in the systematics of the family concerned, but would also have the effect of sinking as a synonym the generic name *Pseudacraea* Westwood [1850], a name widely known to, and used by, workers in the field of mimicry. He commended this proposal to the favourable consideration of the Commission.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Actinote* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) made prior to the present decision ;

(b) to designate *Papilio thalia* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Actinote* Hübner, [1819], with the type species designated in (1) (b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *thalia* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio thalia*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Hemerobius " Linnaeus, 1758, and " Chrysopa " Leach 1815 (Class Insecta, Order Neuroptera) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)42) submitted jointly by Mr. John Cowley (Bridgwater, Somerset, England), Dr. F. J. Killington (Parkstone, Dorset, England), Mr. D. E. Kimmins (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Miss C. E. Longfield (British Museum (Natural History), London), asking that the Commission should use their plenary powers to designate *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 (Class Insecta, Order Neuroptera) (Cowley, Killington, Kimmins & Longfield, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 188–191). The specialists by whom this application was submitted were members of the Sub-Committee on Neuropteroid Groups of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London, and it was by the last-named body that the application had been laid before the Commission.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that in its present form the application now before the Commission had been submitted in June 1937. The same question had however been previously raised in 1927 by Dr. Roger C. Smith (Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas, U.S.A.) and in 1931 by Dr. F. C. Hottes (Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.), but for reasons which it had been impossible to trace neither of those applications had been brought before the Commission for decision. The actual problem raised in this application was very simple : The species *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, was universally accepted as the type species of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, and had been so accepted ever since that name had been published, but under the *Règles* this species was in fact the type species of *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815, whereas the type species of *Hemerobius* Linnaeus was *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus. The strict application of the *Règles* in this case would thus involve the exchange of type species of these two genera and would lead to the greatest confusion not only because of the importance of the genera themselves, but also because each of these genera was the type genus of a family in the

Order Neuroptera. This was therefore a case pre-eminently suitable for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers, for the Congress, when granting those powers in 1913, had expressly referred to the need for preventing by this means the confusion which would arise from the transfer of names from one taxonomic unit to another. The only comments which had been received in regard to this case were :—(1) from Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) and (2) from Dr. C. F. W. Muesebeck (United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.), both of whom supported the application. Dr. Muesebeck had written : " I think this is an excellent illustration of how the principle of establishing an official list may be used. Certainly it would avoid confusion in this case and action by the Commission in this respect would be highly desirable." He (the Acting President) fully shared Dr. Muesebeck's view and he accordingly strongly recommended that the application submitted should be approved.

IN THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it would be a disaster if the Law of Priority were to be allowed to create the confusion which would be inevitable unless the Commission used their plenary powers in the manner proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the under-mentioned genera made prior to the present decision :—

    (i) *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758 ;

    (ii) *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 ;

  (b) to designate *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758 ;

  (c) to designate *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned names on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

  (a) *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758 (with the type species designated in (1)(b) above) ;

  (b) *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 (with the type species designated in (1)(c) above) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

(a) *humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemerobius humulinus*) ;

(b) *perla* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemerobius perla*) ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Articles 34 and 35 : position of a " nomen dubium " in relation to generic and specific homonymy defined.

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S).131) submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot, asking for a ruling on the question whether it was necessary to treat the name *Acarus alatus* Hermann, 1804 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) as an invalid homonym of *Acarus alatus* Schrank, 1803, having regard to the fact that the latter name was a *nomen dubium*, the species so named by Schrank being unrecognisable (Jacot, 1946, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 191).

IN THE DISCUSSION which took place on this application it was observed that the point raised by Dr. Jacot was misconceived, for the *Règles* were concerned exclusively with objective nomenclatorial facts, not with taxonomic conceptions regarding the units to which names were given. The gravest confusion would immediately arise if the *Règles* were to provide that homonyms could be ignored when the older of any pair of homonyms was the name of a species which was unrecognisable. For such a provision would introduce a very dangerous subjective element into the problem of specific homonymy and inevitably lead to different names being used for the same species by different workers, in view of the fact that—as was well known to all systematists—a species that was unrecognisable to one worker was often recognised by another. The answer to the question raised by the late Dr. Jacot must therefore be that a specific name cannot be ignored for the purposes of Article 35 on the ground that it is a *nomen dubium*. In view of the fact that this question had been specifically raised, it would be useful if words were inserted in Article 35 to make the position clear. A corresponding provision should be inserted in Article 34, for a similar problem would arise when a generic name was indeterminate through its type species being unrecognisable.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed that a very dangerous subjective element would be introduced into the problem of specific homonymy if it were permissible to ignore for the purposes of Article 35 a specific name or a specific trivial name on the ground that that name was a

nomen dubium, the species to which it had been applied by its original author being unrecognisable ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1).

(2) recalled that the scheme for the reform of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to specific homonymy agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin made no exception in favour of *nomina dubia* ;

(3) agreed that, in order to prevent any misunderstanding in this matter, it would be desirable that the position in regard to *nomina dubia* in relation to generic and specific homonymy should be dealt with in express terms in Articles 34 and 35 ;

(4) agreed to recommend :—

(a) that words should be inserted in the Article which it had been agreed should replace the existing Article 35 to make it clear (i) that a specific name, which was the older published of a pair of primary homonyms or, as the case might be, of secondary homonyms was not to be ignored for the purposes of this Article on the ground that, judged from the taxonomic standpoint, that name was a *nomen dubium*, the species to which it was applied by its original author being unrecognisable, and therefore (ii) that in such a case the later published of the pair of homonyms concerned is to be rejected in like manner as though the earlier published name was not a *nomen dubium* ;

(b) that the following example should be inserted in the *Règles* to illustrate the proposition laid down in (a) above :—

> In the case of the pair of homonyms constituted by the names *Acarus alatus* Schrank, 1803, and *Acarus alatus* Hermann, 1804, the earlier published of these names is not to be ignored for the purposes of this Article on the ground that it is a *nomen dubium* and accordingly the later published of these names is to be rejected as a homonym.

(c) that words should be inserted in Article 34 to make it clear (i) that a generic name which is the older published of a pair of homonyms is not to be ignored for the purposes of that Article on the ground that, judged from the taxonomic standpoint,

the genus so named is indeterminate, its type species being unrecognisable and having therefore a name which is a *nomen dubium*, and accordingly (ii) that in such a case the later published of the generic names in question is to be rejected as invalid, in like manner as though the type species of the genus bearing the earlier published identical generic name was not a *nomen dubium*.

" Palaeaneilo " Hall, 1869 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Protobranchia) : emendation to " Palaeoneilo " under Article 19

36. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)62) submitted by Dr. L. R. Cox (British Museum (Natural History), London) asking the Commission to give a ruling that the spelling of the generic name *Palaeaneilo* Hall, (J.), 1869 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Protobranchia) should be amended to *Palaeoneilo* (Cox, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 192). Dr. Cox explained in his application that this generic name was intended to suggest that the genus so named was ancestral to the living genus *Neilo* Adams, 1854 . The first part of this compound noun should therefore have been spelt " *Palaeo-*". In fact however it was consistently spelt " *Palaea-*" in the paper in which the name was first published. The genus was of importance in the Palaeozoic Lamellibranchia and, in the submission of the applicant, it would be both objectionable on etymological grounds and calculated to cause confusion if the incorrect spelling used by Hall, when publishing this name, were allowed to stand. Dr. Cox accordingly asked that the required emendation should be authorised by the Commission under their plenary powers. Such action would give validity to the universal practice of specialists in the group concerned.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that two comments had been received in regard to this application : (1) from Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) supporting the action proposed ; (2) from Dr. J. Brookes Knight, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, stating that the Committee had adopted (by a majority of 9 to 2) a resolution opposing the use of the plenary powers in the present case, considering that this was a matter which should be determined by the ordinary provisions of the *Règles*. In his application Dr. Cox had taken the view that the result which he sought could not be attained through Article 19 and it was for this reason that he had asked the Commission to use their plenary powers. This was a matter however which must not be

prejudged and which the Commission would need to consider before they examined the need for, or the desirability of, using the plenary powers in this case.

IN THE DISCUSSION which followed, the view was expressed that, having regard to the fact that the compound word selected for this generic name was intended to denote that this genus was regarded by its author as being ancestral to the living genus *Neilo* Adams, it was quite " évident " that the first portion of the compound word was based upon the Greek adjective παλαιός, in exactly the same way as in the 500 odd other generic names similarly formed. In these circumstances it was " évident " also that the spelling " Palaeaneilo " was incorrect and a " faute d'orthographe ". In these circumstances the spelling should be corrected by the emendation of the name to " Palaeoneilo " under the provisions of Article 19. There was therefore no need to consider the portion of the application which related to the possible use of the plenary powers in this case.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that it was " évident " that the spelling of the generic name *Palaeaneilo* Hall, 1869 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Protobranchia) was a " faute d'orthographe " and therefore that the spelling of this name should be corrected by emending the name to *Palaeoneilo* under the provisions of Article 19 ;

(2) to placé the generic name *Palaeoneilo* Hall, 1869 (type species : *Nuculites constricta* Conrad (T.A.), 1842, by selection by Hall (1885)) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *constricta* Conrad, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Nuculites constricta*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Part 9 of Volume 1 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " : applications published in, to be considered in turn.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

37. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 9 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 27 papers relating to 24 individual problems of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that two of the papers published in Part 9 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* had already been considered at the

meeting noted in the margin in connection with the problem presented by the names *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 ;

(2) agreed to examine, in turn, each of the remaining 23 applications, 25 papers relating to which had been published in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin*.

Article 5 (position when the type genus of a ... family is united with another genus and the combined genus is treated as belonging to the same family as a third genus, having an older name than either of the other genera) problem to be dealt with in Report to be prepared by Secretary.

38. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)29) submitted by Dr. H. W. Manter (Department of Zoology and Anatomy, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, U.S.A.) asking for a ruling on the question of the name to be employed for the family containing the genus *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) (Manter, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 197-198). The problem for consideration arose through the action, first, of Goto (1919) in sinking the genus *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira as a synonym of *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915, second, of Fukui (1928) in treating *Gyliauchen* Nicoll, 1915 (with which also he synonymised *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918) as belonging to the same family as the genus *Opistholebes* Nicoll, 1915, the generic name of which had page priority over the name *Gyliauchen* Nicoll. The questions at issue were : Should Goto (1919) have changed the family name from DISSOTREMATIDAE to GYLIAUCHENIDAE, and was Fukui correct in changing the family name to OPISTHOLEBETIDAE ?

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that the general principle involved in the present application had been raised by himself in Point (36) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. When considering this matter, the Commission had recognised that this was an important matter on which it was very desirable that adequate provision should be made in the *Règles*. They had taken the view, however, that, as it raised one of the most difficult questions involved in the nomenclature of families, it would prejudice the inquiry which, at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had invited the Secretary to undertake into the whole problem of the nomenclature of this category of name, if a decision were now to be taken on this particular aspect of the subject. The Commission had accordingly agreed to make no recommendation to the present Congress for the clarification of the *Règles* in this regard but to invite the Secretary to pay special attention to this problem in the Report on the general problem of the nomenclature of families which they had invited him to prepare. He (the

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

Acting President) considered therefore that no decision could properly be taken on the individual case submitted by Dr. Manter. He suggested however that the documents relating to that case should be added to the *dossier* of papers to be studied by the Secretary at the outset of the investigation which he had been invited to undertake.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to defer taking a decision on the question of the name of the family of the genus *Dissotrema* Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) submitted by Dr. H. W. Manter, until after the receipt of the comprehensive Report on the nomenclature of families which the Secretary to the Commission had been invited to prepare for the consideration of the Commission at their Session to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the International Congress of Zoology ;

(2) that the papers relating to the case submitted by Dr. Manter should be added to the *dossier* to be studied by the Secretary to the Commission at the outset of the investigation referred to in (1) above ;

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to write to Dr. Manter informing him of the foregoing decision and explaining the grounds on which it had been taken.

Pallas (P.S.), "Zoographia rosso-asiatica" : dates of publication of the several volumes of, determined.

39. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)25) submitted by the late Mr. W. L. Sclater, as Chairman of the "Zoological Record" Committee of the Zoological Society of London, asking for a ruling on the dates to be accepted as the dates of publication of the several volumes of Pallas (P.S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica* (Sclater, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 198-199), together with a paper by the late Dr. C. D. Sherborn, setting out the data available in regard to the above subject (Sherborn, 1947, *ibid.* **1** : 199–200).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, prior to the opening of the present Congress, the Commission would have had no guiding principle by which to consider the present application. In view however of the provisions which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* for the purpose of determining the dates of publication of works containing zoological names, the problem before the Commission no longer presented any difficulty. Copies bearing the date "1811" were known

both of volume 1 and of volume 2 of Pallas's *Zoographia*. There was no evidence to rebut the initial assumption (now to be adopted in such cases) that the date printed on the title page was correct; in these circumstances the late Dr. Sherborn had been right in adopting the date "1811" for the first two volumes of the *Zoographia*. The third volume was undated in the first issue and it was therefore necessary to determine by reference to contemporary literature the date by which at latest that volume must have been published. Dr. Sherborn had shown that this date was "1814."

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) that under the provisions added to the *Règles* during the present Congress the dates to be assigned to the several volumes of Pallas (P.S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica*, were :—

Volume 1	1811
Volume 2	1811
Volume 3	[1814];

(*For the decision under which the date assigned to Vol.* 3 *(but not those assigned to Vols.* 1 *and* 2*) is here placed in square brackets, see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 19)

(2) that, in view of (1) above, new names published in the foregoing work rank for purposes of priority as from the dates severally specified above;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

"Clavellarius" Olivier, 1789 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera): suppression of, under the plenary powers (decision supplementary to "Opinion" 144)

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 2)

40. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a joint communication (file Z.N.(S.) 120) received from Dr. H. H. Ross and Dr. B. D. Burke (then of the Illinois State Natural History Survey, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.) drawing attention to the fact that, although at Lisbon the Commission had used their plenary powers to suppress the name *Crabro* Geoffroy, 1762, for the purpose of validating the name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), there nevertheless still remained a generic name, *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, which had the same type species as, and had priority over, the name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790, the latter being indeed no more than a *nom. nov. pro Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, which in 1790 Olivier had considered should be discarded on the ground that it was too close to the generic name *Clavaria*, already used in botany (Ross and Burke, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 201–202). At the same time, the Commission had under consideration a note on this case by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 202–203).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the communication received from Dr. Ross

and Dr. Burke disclosed a defect in the action taken by the Commission when validating the generic name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790. As that action had been taken under the plenary powers, its validity was not in any circumstances open to question. Nevertheless, it was anomalous and unsatisfactory in such a case to leave unsuppressed a name (such as *Clavellarius* Olivier) which, as the result of action taken under the plenary powers in regard to another name (in the present case, the name *Cimbex* Olivier) could never be used, even though it was the oldest name for the taxonomic unit in question. He had accordingly proposed (in the paper cited above) that the Commission should regularise the position by using their plenary powers to suppress both the generic name *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789, and its emendation *Clavellaria* Lamarck, 1801. No objection to the action proposed had been received from any source. Since the object of this proposal was to complete the action necessary to confer availability upon another generic name (*Cimbex* Olivier) and to secure that neither of the names to be suppressed should be available for use in any other sense as from some later date, the suppression should, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, be limited to suppression for the purposes of Article 25 (Law of Priority) and should not affect the status of the names concerned in relation to Article 34 (Law of Homonymy).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of Article 25 the under-mentioned generic names :—

Clavellarius Olivier, 1789
Clavellaria Lamarck, 1801 ;

(2) to place the generic names specified in (1) above on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" ;

(3) to render an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 144, recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

"Bombus" Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : validation of, under the plenary powers, in so far as necessary.

41. THE COMMISSION had before them an application (file Z.N.(S.) 133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) that the plenary powers should be used to conserve the well-known generic name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards,

1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 204). In submitting this proposal the foregoing specialists were acting as members of the Hymenoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London and it was at the request of those bodies that the application had been laid before the Commission.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that at the time when the present application was submitted to the Commission the name *Bombus* Latreille was in universal use among hymenopterists, other than those who had recognised the names published in the "Erlangen List" of 1801. In 1935, however, the Commission had used their plenary powers to suppress that List (*Opinion* 135) and in consequence the name *Bremus* Jurine, 1801, of that List (which, as explained, had been used by some hymenopterists in preference to *Bombus* Latreille) had ceased to have any nomenclatorial standing. Unfortunately, however, that decision had not completely cleared the way for the universal acceptance of the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802, for there remained the name *Bremus* as published by Panzer-Jurine in Part 85 (pls. 19–21) of the *Faun. Ins. germ.*, which was attributed by some authors to 1801, and thus, if this date was correct, had priority over *Bombus* Latreille. Since the present application was submitted, Miss G. A. Sandhouse (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had published (1943) a review of the type species of the genera of bees, in which she had expressed the view that the date of publication of the name *Bremus* in the *Faun. Ins. germ.* was uncertain and had stated that, according to Sherborn, the correct date was "1804." She had accordingly taken the view that the name *Bombus* Latreille had priority over the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine. She had agreed generally with the proposal that the name *Bremus* should be suppressed, if necessary.

(*Previous reference Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

Continuing, the Acting President said the only entomologist who had notified the Commission of any criticism to the action proposed in this case was Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) who had stated that he had strong personal objection to that proposal, on the ground that, in his view, the data furnished in support of the action proposed were not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers. Finally, he had to report that he had been informed by Commissioner Mortensen (Denmark) that, if he had been able to attemd the present meeting, he would have voted in favour of the present proposal. The Acting President added that, speaking personally as a member of the Commission, he felt

bound to express the view that an extremely well-known name such as *Bombus* Latreille should not be discarded lightly for purely nomenclatorial reasons, in view of the extensive literature associated with that name. This name fell within the class of names covered by the resolution adopted at the meeting of the Commission held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature (as noted in the margin) in which the Commission were enjoined to give specially sympathetic consideration to applications submitted for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of preventing the upsetting of well-known names. It would, in his opinion, be particularly wrong for the Commission to countenance the upsetting of such a name where, as in the present instance, there was substantial doubt as to the validity of the claims advanced in favour of the priority of the allegedly older name. He therefore recommended that the Commission should accept the view that the name *Bombus* Latreille should be preserved. In existing circumstances, this object could, it appeared, be achieved by the Commission placing the name *Bombus* Latreille on the " Official List " without recourse to the use of their plenary powers. In order however, to ward against the risk that it might later be established that *Bremus* Jurine (as published in Part 85 of the *Faun. Ins. germ.*) had been published before the name *Bombus* Latreille and therefore that the entry of that name on the " Official List " was invalid, it would be prudent if the Commission were to follow a precedent which they had adopted in similar cases in the past and were accordingly now to use their plenary powers to such extent, if any, as might be necessary to validate the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802, as against the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine, a name at the present time of indeterminate date.

(*Previous reference Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

General agreement was expressed with the view submitted by the Acting President and with the course of action which he had recommended.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to such extent, if any, as might be necessary to validate the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) as against the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine (as published in Part 85 of the *Faun. Ins. germ.*), a name of at present indeterminate date, in the event of it later being established that that name had priority over *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 ;

(2) to place the name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (type species, by monotypy: *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758), validated, to such extent, if any, as might be necessary, under the decision taken in (1) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the name *Bremus* Panzer-Jurine [1801–1804], on the corresponding " Official Index " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis terrestris*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Ceratina " Latreille [1802-1803], and " Diodontus " Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) (applications for use of plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

42. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (file Z.N.(S.)133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers :—

(a) an application for the validation of the generic name *Ceratina* Latreille, [1802–1803] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) by the suppression of the earlier name *Clavicera* Latreille [1802] (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 205) ;

(b) an application that the Commission should designate *Pemphredon tristis* Van der Linden, 1829, as the type species of the genus *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), a well-known genus round which a considerable volume of bionomic and zoogeographical literature had grown up (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 206).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as in the application relating to the name *Bombus* Latreille which had just been considered by the Commission, the specialists by whom the present applications had been prepared had submitted those applications to the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London in their capacity as members of the Hymenoptera Sub-Committee of that Committee. These applications had been submitted to the Commission by the Royal Entomological Society on the advice of the above Committee. Only one

objection to the action proposed had been received. This was contained in a letter from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) who had entered a strong personal objection on the ground that the evidence submitted was not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers in these cases. The Commission, in considering these applications, would no doubt give full weight to this aspect of the question.

In the subsequent discussion the view was expressed that there might well be strong grounds for the use of the plenary powers in these cases but that, as submitted, these applications did not clearly show that greater confusion than uniformity would ensue, if the plenary powers were not used. In the circumstances the best course would be to refer these applications back to the applicants with a request for further information on the foregoing question.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the names *Ceratina* Latreille [1802–1803], and *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above ;

(3) to defer taking a decision on either of the applications referred to above, until the supplementary statement in regard thereto, asked for in (2) above, was available.

"Formica" Linnaeus, 1758, and "Camponotus" Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : addition of, to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"

43. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Fèrrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to preserve the existing usage of the generic names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) by

cancelling the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207) ;

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission pointing out that under the decision taken by the Commission at Lisbon to amplify the interpretation of Article 30 in relation to Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*, given in *Opinion* 11, a decision which was later (1939) embodied in *Opinion* 136, the difficulty which the present application was designed to overcome had disappeared, for, under the amplified interpretation given in *Opinion* 136, the action taken by Latreille in 1810 did not constitute a selection of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207 *nota* 11).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, for the reasons explained in the note which he had published in the previous year, all difficulty in this case had disappeared and the ground was clear therefore for the names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861, to be added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " without resort by the Commission to their plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that no type selection within the meaning of Rule (g) in Article 30 was made for the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, by Latreille in 1810 (*Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*), that under the *Règles* the type species of this genus was *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, that species having been the first of the originally included species to have been duly so selected under Rule (g) in Article 30 (by Curtis, 1839), and therefore that no question arose of the Commission having to use their plenary powers to designate that species as the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned generic names with the type species severally specified below on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

Formica Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by selection by Curtis, 1839 : *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758)

Camponotus Mayr, 1861 (type species, by selection by Bingham, 1903 : *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

rufa Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Formica rufa*)

ligniperda Latreille, 1802 (as published in the binominal combination *Formica ligniperda*) ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Gorytes " Latreille [Sept., 1804], " Harpactus " Shuckard, 1837, " Macropis " Panzer, [1806-1809] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) (applications for use of plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

44. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (file Z.N.(S.)133) relating to generic names in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M.Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) :—

(a) an application for the validation of the generic name *Gorytes* Latreille, [Sept., 1804] (*in* Sonnini's Buffon, *Hist.nat.gén.partic.Crust.Ins.* 13 : 308) type species, by selection by Latreille, 1810 : *Sphex mystacea* Linnaeus, 1761) by the suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name *Gorytes* Latreille [March, 1804] (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* **24** : 180) (type species, by monotypy : *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793), with the consequent automatic validation of the generic name *Hoplisus* Lepeletier, 1832 (type species, by selection by Westwood, 1839 : *Mellinus quinquecinctus* Fabricius, 1793) (Benson, Ferrière, & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 208) ;

(b) an application (i) for the suppression under the plenary powers of the name *Harpactus* (emend. of *Arpactus*) Panzer, 1806, and of all subsequent uses of either name prior to Shuckard, 1837, and (ii) for the validation of the generic name *Harpactus* as from Shuckard, 1837, with *Arpactus formosus* Jurine, 1807 (=*Mutilla laevis* Latreille, 1792) as type species (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 209) ;

(c) an application for the validation of the generic name *Macropis* Panzer [1806–1809] (type species, by

monotypy : *Macropis labiata* Fabricius [1804–1805]) by suppressing, under the plenary powers, the selection of the above species by Westwood (1840) as the type species of the genus *Megilla* Fabricius [1804–1805] (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 210).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

The view was expressed that the foregoing applications were incomplete in the same respects as those relating to the names *Ceratina* Latreille [1802–1803], and *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834. It was felt therefore that the two sets of applications should be treated in a similar manner and that consideration of the present applications should be postponed for the purpose of enabling additional information to be obtained.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the names *Gorytes* Latreille [Sept. 1804], *Harpactus* (emend. of *Arpactus*) Panzer, 1806, and *Macropis* Panzer [1806–1809] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above, and, in the case of the name *Arpactus* Panzer, 1806, the grounds on which Shuckard's emendation to *Harpactus* was thought to be justified under Article 19 of the *Règles* ;

(3) to defer taking a decision on any of the applications referred to above, until the supplementary statements in regard thereto, asked for in (2) above, were severally available.

" Megachile " Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) : type species of, determined

45. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M.Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London), and Dr. O. W. Richards (Im-

perial College of Science and Technology, London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Apis muraria* Retzius, 1783, as the type species of the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) and to designate in the place of that species *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus (i.e., the species so selected by Curtis in 1828) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 211) ;

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission pointing out that, under the decision taken by the Commission at Lisbon to amplify the interpretation of Article 30 in relation to Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*, given in *Opinion* 11, a decision which was later (1939) embodied in *Opinion* 136, the difficulty which the present application was designed to overcome had disappeared, for, under the amplified interpretation given in *Opinion* 136, the action taken by Latreille in 1810 did not constitute a selection of *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 211, *nota* 20).

(*Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 43)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present case was similar to that of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, which the Commission had considered a few minutes earlier, for in each case the difficulty which had confronted the applicants was due to the incomplete and partially misleading interpretation of Article 30 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 11. In each case the difficulties in question had disappeared as soon as the amplification of *Opinion* 11 agreed upon at Lisbon became available through the publication of *Opinion* 136. Now that it was realised that Latreille (1810) did not select a type species for the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, it was found that the next type selection, that by Curtis (1828), was perfectly satisfactory, for that author had selected as the type species of this genus the species, *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, which the applicants had asked the Commission to use their plenary powers so to designate. The ground was thus cleared for the name *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, to be placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " without resort by the Commission to their plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that no type selection within the meaning of Rule (g) in Article 30 having been made for the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802, by Latreille in 1810 (*Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*) under the *Règles*, the type species of this genus was *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, that species being the first of the originally included species to have been duly so selected under Rule (g) in Article 30 (by Curtis, 1828), and therefore that no question arose of the Commission having to use their plenary powers to designate that species as the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (type species, by selection by Curtis, 1828 : *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758) on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis centuncularis*) on the " Officia List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Seven generic names in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) (applications for use of plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

46. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (file Z.N.(S.)133) relating to the proposed use of the plenary powers in the manner indicated below submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) :—

" Methocha " Latreille [March, 1804]

(a) an application (i) for the recognition of the emendation to *Methoca* of the spelling of the generic name published by Latreille in 1804 as *Methocha* and (ii) for the validation of the specific name *Methoca ichneumonides* Latreille, [Sept. 1804] as the name of the type species of the genus *Methoca* Latreille [March 1804], by the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the specific name *Mutilla articulata* Latreille, 1792, previously bestowed upon that species. (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 212) ;

" Notozus " Förster, 1853

(b) an application for the validation of the generic name *Notozus* Förster, 1853 (type species, by selection by Ashmead, 1902 : *Hedychrum spina* Lepeletier, 1806) by the suppression, under the plenary powers, of

the generic name *Elampus* Spinola, 1806, the type species of which, *Chrysis panzeri* Fabricius, [1804–1805] (by selection by Latreille, 1810) is regarded by specialists as subjectively identical with the type species of the genus *Notozus* Förster (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 213) ;

"Nysso" Latreille, 1796

(c) an application for the use of the plenary powers to emend to *Nysson* the spelling of the generic name originally published as *Nysso* Latreille, 1796 (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 214) ;

"Odynerus" Latreille, [1802-1803]

(d) an application for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the selection by Westwood (1840) of *Vespa muraria* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Odynerus* Latreille, [1802–1803] (a genus based upon a misidentified type species) and the designation in the place of that species of *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 215) ;

"Ponera" Latreille, 1804

(e) an application for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Formica crassinoda* Latreille, 1802, as the type species of *Ponera* Latreille, 1804, and the designation in the place of that species of *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1802, as the type species of this genus (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 216) ;

"Rhopalum" Stephens, 1829

(f) an application for the validation of the generic name *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829 (type species, by selection by Curtis, 1837 : *Crabro rufiventris* Panzer, 1799) by the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the generic name *Euplilis* Risso, 1826, the type species of which is the same species (by selection by Pate, 1935) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 217) ;

"Solenius" Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835

(g) an application for the suppression of the selection by Westwood (1839) of *Sphex vaga* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Solenius* Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835 (a genus based on a misidentified type species) and the designation in place of that species of *Crabro continuus* Fabricius [1804–1805] (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 218).

The view was expressed that in these cases also, as in the applications considered in Conclusions 42 and 44 above, the information available was not sufficient to enable a decision to be reached on the question whether the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed, and therefore that the consideration of these applications should be postponed until additional information was available. In addition in the case of the applications relating to *Methocha* Latreille [March 1804], and *Nysso* Latreille, 1796, it was felt that, before the Commission could consider whether the plenary powers should be used in relation to *Methocha* Latreille [March 1804], and *Nysso* statements should be furnished discussing the question whether these emendations could not be made under Article 19, without the use of the plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the under-mentioned seven generic names in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed :—

(a) *Methocha* Latreille [March 1804] ;
(b) *Notozus* Förster, 1853 ;
(c) *Nysso* Latreille, 1796 ;
(d) *Odynerus* Latreille [1802–1803] ;
(e) *Ponera* Latreille, 1804 ;
(f) *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829 ;
(g) *Solenius* Lepeletier and Brullé, 1835 ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above, and, in the case of the names *Methocha* Latreille, 1804 (case (a) above) and *Nysso* Latreille, 1796 (case (c) above), discussing the question whether or not these emendations could properly be made under Article 19, a question on which the Commission would need to reach a decision before considering whether the use of the plenary powers in the case of these names would be appropriate ;

(3) to defer taking decisions on the applications referred to above until the supplementary statements in regard thereto, asked for in (2) above were severally available.

Two species in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) (proposed use of the plenary powers to conserve the trivial names in common use for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained.

47. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the under-mentioned applications (files Z.N.(S.)134 and 135) for the stabilisation, under the plenary powers, of the trivial names shown below for two species in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta), submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History), London), M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London), and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)134) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to secure that the trivial name *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Vespa arvensis*) shall continue to be used for the species commonly known as *Mellinus arvensis* (Linnaeus) (Benson, Ferrière & Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 219) ;

(b) an application (file Z.N.(S.)135) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to secure that the trivial name *agrorum* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis agrorum*) shall continue to be used for the species commonly known as *Bombus agrorum* (Fabricius) (e.g., as defined by Saunders, 1896, *Hymen. Acul. Brit. Islands* : 367).

The view was expressed that the foregoing applications were incomplete in the same respects as those considered in Conclusions 42, 44 and 46 above, the information available not being sufficient to enable a decision to be reached on the question whether the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed. It was accordingly felt that these applications also should be postponed until additional information was available. It would be convenient also if when that information was asked for, a request were added for the addition of a bibliographic reference to the use of the trivial name *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Vespa arvensis*) in the sense in which it was desired that that name should be stabilised, similar to the corresponding reference included in the application submitted for the stabilisation of the trivial name *agrorum* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the combination *Apis agrorum*) (file Z.N.(S.) 135).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in relation to the trivial names *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Vespa arvensis*) and *agrorum* Fabricius, 1787 (as published in the binominal combination *Apis agrorum*) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the cases specified in (1) above, and in the case of the first of the names in question, to cite a bibliographical reference to the use of the trivial name *arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758, in the sense in which it is desired that that name should be stabilised ;

(3) to defer decisions on the applications specified in (1) above until the supplementary statements, asked for in (2) above, were severally available.

" Erycina " Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

48. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 69) submitted by Dr. Harald A. Rehder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.), for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to set aside the selection made by Anton (1839) under Rule (g) of Article 30 of *Erycina elliptica* Lamarck, 1805, as the type species of the genus *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta) and in place to designate *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, as the type species of this genus (Rehder, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 221–222). In submitting this application, Dr. Rehder had expressed the view that the acceptance of *Erycina elliptica* Lamarck, 1805, as the type species of this genus would mean (i) that the name *Erycina* would be used for the group long known as *Diplodonta* Bronn and *Taras* Risso and (ii) that the genus *Erycina* of authors would need a new name. Dr. Rehder had added that this transposition would cause endless confusion, especially as both groups were common as Tertiary fossils and were used as index fossils in stratigraphy.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the foregoing application had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America which, by a majority of ten votes to one had voted in favour of supporting the use of the plenary powers in the manner proposed. No objection to the proposal had been received from any source.

THE COMMISSION agreed

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta) made prior to the present decision ;

(b) to designate *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805, with the type species specified in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(3) to place the trivial name *pellucida* Lamarck, 1805 (as published in the binominal combination *Erycina pellucida*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Gesner, 1758, " Tractatus physicus de petrificatis " : suppression of, for nomenclatorial purposes, under the plenary powers

49. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)146) submitted by Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) on the subject of the status of names as published by Gesner (J.) in 1758 in his *Tractatus physicus de petrificatis* (Knight, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 222). In submitting this application, Dr. Knight had explained that in this work Gesner had published Latin designations which appeared to be generic names but had published no trivial names for species. Some of these designations had been used as generic names by later authors, by whom species had been referred to the genera in question. Since about 1830, the use of most of these names (all of which ended in "-ites ") had been discontinued. The few which remained in use were attributed to authors subsequent to Gesner. Dr. Knight had submitted two requests to the Commission : (1) that they should give a ruling on the question whether names published by Gesner in his *Tractatus* of 1758 were available under the *Règles*, (2) that, if the answer to the foregoing question were to be in the affirmative, the Commis-

sion should use their plenary powers to render those names unavailable by suppressing the whole of the *Tractatus* for nomenclatorial purposes.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had been informed by the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America that, although it had not been found possible to take a vote of the members of the Joint Committee on this case, four of the members of the Committee (Wells, Moore, Cooper, Keen) had expressed themselves " as favouring suppression ". The Acting President added that, speaking as a member of the Commission, his own view was that Gesner's *Tractatus* was not a binominal work and therefore that the new " names " published therein could properly be rejected on the ground that in the *Tractatus* Gesner had not complied with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 (that is to say, he had not " appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale "). If the Commission possessed a salaried staff and were thus able themselves to undertake detailed research on problems arising out of applications submitted to them, the ideal course in cases of this sort would be for them to investigate in detail the question whether a given book complied with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 and to reserve the use of their plenary powers for those cases where it was clear that the work in question was a binominal work but where the use of the new names published in that work would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. However, with its limited funds and its honorary spare-time staff, the Commission could not normally undertake investigations of this sort. In existing conditions, it was therefore frequently necessary for the Commission to consider jointly the question whether a given work was an available work and the question whether it was desirable that, if the answer to the first question was in the affirmative, the plenary powers should be used to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any new names published in that work. This was apparently the course which has been followed by the American specialists to whom he had referred, for they had expressed themselves as being in favour of the suppression of Gesner's *Tractatus* under the plenary powers, without having expressed an opinion on the prior question whether in fact under the *Règles* that work was an available work. In the present case, he (the Acting President) thought that this was the right line to adopt. Every specialist who had expressed an opinion to the Commission was in favour of the rejection of the " names " published by Gesner. This being so, the method to be adopted to secure

(*For the decision to amend the wording of Proviso* (b) *to Article 25 to read as here shown, see Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

this end was purely one of machinery. The simplest method of achieving this object would be by the use of the plenary powers. This therefore was the course which he recommended the Commission to adopt.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that the specialists who had expressed an opinion on the application submitted in regard to the treatment of new " names " published in 1758 in Gesner's *Tractatus physicus de petrificatis* were unanimous in considering that those " names " should not be accepted ;

(2) without prejudice to the question whether in his *Tractatus* of 1758 Gesner applied the principles of binominal nomenclature and therefore whether new " names " in that work possessed any availability under the *Règles*, agreed to use their plenary powers in so far as necessary to suppress the foregoing work for all nomenclatorial purposes;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 47)

(3) placed on record that, in view of the decision specified in (2) above, any " name ", the first publication of which subsequent to 1757 was in Gesner's *Tractatus* of 1758, ranks for purposes of the Law of Priority (Article 25) and of the Law of Homonymy (Article 34) as from the date subsequent to the *Tractatus* on which it was first published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;

(4) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Liodes " Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) to be rejected as a homonym of " Leiodes " Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera)

50. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)64) submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot, asking for a ruling on the question whether the generic name *Liodes* Heyden 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) should, under Article 34, be rejected as a homonym of the generic name *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (Jacot, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 223) ;

(b) a paper by the Secretary to the Commission pointing out that under Article 35(3), as applied to Article 34 (generic names) by *Opinion* 147,

generic names differing from one another in spelling only in the manner shown in the example cited by Dr. Jacot (*Leiodes* and *Liodes*) were to be regarded as homonyms of one another in those cases where the names in question consisted of words having "the same origin and meaning" but not otherwise (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 223–224).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 41)

It was pointed out that the position in regard to these names must now be judged in the light of the criteria which it had been agreed to recommend should be inserted in Article 34. The view was expressed that there could be no reasonable doubt that these two names were based upon the same Greek word. They must therefore be regarded as homonyms of one another.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796, and *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, are homonyms of one another and therefore that the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826, as the later published of the two names, is invalid ;

(2) to place the name *Liodes* Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Report to the Congress on the work performed during the Paris Session : two supplementary points submitted to the Section on Nomenclature

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting Conclusion* 6)

51. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when at the joint meeting held at 0915 hours that morning the Section on Nomenclature had approved and adopted the Report adopted by the Commission for submission to the Congress at the final Plenary Session to be held on the morning of the following day (Tuesday, 27th July, 1948) and had invited him, as Secretary to the Commission, to present that Report to the Congress on their behalf with an indication that it had been approved and adopted by the Section on Nomenclature as well as by the Commission, the Section had agreed also that, if, as the result of discussions in the Section subsequent to the adoption of the Commission's Report, the Commission and the Section were to agree to make any additions to the Report, the additions so agreed upon should be made before the Report was submitted to the Congress.

There were two points arising out of this decision to which he (the Acting President) wished to refer. The first was concerned with the interpretation of the Report; the second involved the insertion in the Report of an additional sentence. As regards the first of these points, it was important that it should be clearly placed on record that the approval of the Commission's Report signified by the Section at their morning's meeting applied not only to the recommendations submitted to the Section by the Commission up to the time when at that meeting the approval of the Section was so signified but also to recommendations submitted by the Commission to the Section and approved by the Section in the period between the adoption by the Section of the Commission's Report and the close of the final meeting of the Section held during the present (Paris) Congress, for it was essential that at the final *Concilium Plenum* the Congress should be made fully aware of conclusions reached by the Section. In order to clear the position in this regard up to the close of the present meeting, he (the Acting President) proposed that the Commission should now formally adjourn for a few minutes to enable him on their behalf to invite the Section to place on record that the approval of the recommendations submitted by the Commission in regard to the amendment of the *Règles* recorded by the Section in approving and adopting the Commission's Report applied not only to the recommendations submitted to, and approved by, the Section up to that moment, but also to the recommendations similarly submitted and approved (1) in the portion of the 11th Meeting of the Commission (and the 3rd Meeting of the Section) held subsequent to the adoption thereat by the Section of the Commission's Report, (2) during the joint meeting held that afternoon at 1445 hours (i.e. at the 12th Meeting of the Commission and the 4th Meeting of the Section), and (3) during the present meeting (i.e. the 13th Meeting of the Commission and the 5th Meeting of the Section). The second of the points to which he (the Acting President) had referred was concerned with the insertion in the Commission's Report of a sentence referring to the fact that during the present (Paris) Session the Commission had reached decisions on a large number of applications submitted to them on individual nomenclatorial problems. He had always hoped, as had the other members of the Commission, that it would be possible to make progress in this field during the Paris Session, but it had not been possible for him to insert a reference to this matter in the draft Report (Commission Paper I.C.(48)20) which had been considered that morning, for up to that time the Commission had not been able to devote any time

to the consideration of individual applications, the whole of their energies having been directed to the consideration of proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. Great progress had now, however, been made in this important part of the work of the Commission, and he (the Acting President) therefore suggested that the Commission should agree to insert in their Report a paragraph dealing with this matter and should invite the Section on Nomenclature to concur in this course.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to insert in their Report to the Congress on the work performed during the present (Paris) Session a paragraph recording that during that Session the Commission had reached decisions on a large number of applications on individual nomenclatorial problems which had been submitted to them and to invite the Section on Nomenclature to signify their approval of the addition to the Report of the foregoing paragraph ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 6(2)(b))

(2) in accordance with the procedure agreed upon earlier that day at the meeting noted in the margin, to request the Section to signify that the approval of the recommendations submitted by the Commission in regard to the amendment of the *Règles* expressed by the Section when, at the meeting referred to above, they had approved and adopted the Report prepared by the Commission for submission to the Congress at the final *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following morning, should be held to cover also the recommendations further regarding the amendment of the *Règles* unanimously adopted by the Commission, in agreement with the Section, at the following joint meetings held during the present day :—

(a) the portion, subsequent to the adoption of the Commission's Report by the Commission and the Section, of the meeting held in the forenoon (11th Meeting of the Commission and 3rd Meeting of the Section) ;

(b) the meeting held that afternoon at 1445 hours (12th Meeting of the Commission and 4th Meeting of the Section) ;

(c) the meeting held on the same afternoon at 1730 hours (13th Meeting of the Commission and 5th Meeting of the Section) ;

(3) to recommend the Section on Nomenclature formally to take note of, and approve, the conclusions in regard to individual nomenclatorial problems reached by the Commission, in agreement with the Section, at the joint meetings of the Commission and the Section specified in (2) above ;

(4) to invite the Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, to lay before the Section on Nomenclature the recommendations specified in (1) to (3) above and to seek the approval of the Section therefor.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned to enable the Acting President to submit the foregoing recommendations to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

(*On resumption*)

Fourteenth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 2*)

52. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that there still remained a number of applications relating to individual cases, on which it was highly important that decisions should be reached before the close of the Congress. For this purpose, as had been foreseen at the first of the meetings held that day, it would be necessary for the Commission to hold a further meeting that evening after dinner. There would be no possibility of arranging for a meeting of the Section on Nomenclature to be held after that meeting for the purpose of taking note of conclusions then reached by the Commission or of considering any recommendations which the Commission might then agree to submit. In his capacity as President of the Section on Nomenclature, he proposed therefore that the evening meeting should, like the other meetings held that day, be a joint meeting of the Commission and the Section. As such, it would be open to any member of the Congress to take part in it. He proposed that the meeting should start at 2030 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of, and approved, the proposals submitted by the Acting President.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1910 *hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Fourteenth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 2030 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Sixth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)

Part 10 of Volume 1 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " : applications published in, to be considered in turn
(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 28)

1. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 10 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 22 papers relating to 15 individual problems of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note that one of the papers published in Part 10 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* had already been considered at the meeting noted in the margin in connection with the problem of the nomenclature of Orders and higher taxonomic units ;

(2) agreed to examine, in turn, each of the remaining 14 applications, 21 papers relating to which had been published in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin*,

" Raphistoma " Rafinesque, 1815, and " Belone " Oken, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) suppressed and " Raphistoma " Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) and " Belone " Cuvier, 1817 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) validated, under the plenary powers

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a joint application (file Z.N.(S.)145) from the undermentioned specialists in the field of Palaeozoic Gastropods and living fishes for the suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) and the validation under the same powers of the generic name *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) :—

Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.),

Dr. L. R. Cox (British Museum (Natural History), London) (see also (b) below),

Dr. K. P. Oakley (British Museum (Natural History), London),

Dr. Josiah Bridge (United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.),

Dr. Edwin Kirk (United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.),

the late Dr. J. R. Norman (formerly of the British Museum (Natural History), London),

Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (British Museum (Natural History), London),

the late Dr. E. O. Ulrich (formerly of the United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.),

Dr. Leonard P. Schultz (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.),

Professor George S. Myers (Natural History Museum, Stanford University, California, U.S.A.) (see also (c) below) (see Knight and the other specialists cited above, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 225–227) ;

(b) a supplementary note by Dr. L. R. Cox, explaining that, while he supported the use of the plenary powers in the present case (see (a) above), he was not altogether convinced that this course was necessary, believing that it was possible to argue that, under the *Règles*, *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815, was a *nomen nudum* (not having been published with an " indication ") and therefore that the name *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847, was already an available name (Cox, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 227) ;

(c) a supplementary note by Professor George S. Myers (see (a) above), expressing doubts similar to those expressed by Dr. Cox (see (b) above) but, like Dr. Cox, supporting the use of the plenary powers, in order to prevent the confusion which would arise from the use of the name *Raphistoma* in ichthyology (Myers, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 227–228).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, subsequent to its publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, this application had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Palaeontology in America, which had given it their support. Further, Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.), had written a letter supporting the action proposed. On the question of the method to be adopted to secure the desired end, Mr. Baily had expressed a strong preference for proceeding by the plenary powers rather than by way of interpretation. He had added that, in addition to the reasons advanced in the application published in the *Bulletin*, there was another strong reason in favour of conserving the name *Raphistoma* Hall, for that genus presented features believed to be characteristic of the ancestral Gastropod, and in consequence the name *Raphistoma* was of special importance in discussions on primitive fossil molluscs of doubtful affinities. In addition, Dr. Robert R. Miller (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had informed him (the Acting President) that he would be strongly opposed to the use of the name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque for a genus of fishes. No objection to the action proposed had been received from any source. Turning to the actual proposal itself, the Acting President said that, while the generic name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque had been introduced in a very unsatisfactory way, it could not, he thought, be claimed that it had been published without an "indication" in view of the reference to Gronovius which Rafinesque had given. If, therefore (as he hoped would be the case), the Commission agreed to approve the proposal submitted by Dr. Brookes Knight and his colleagues, it would be necessary to use the plenary powers. Further, he thought that it would be desirable that, if the Commission validated the name *Raphistoma* Hall (Class Gastropoda), they should validate also the name *Belone* Cuvier, 1817 (Class Pisces), the validity of which, as the applicants had pointed out, could not be established until the name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque had been suppressed. Incidentally, it would be necessary also to suppress the earlier name *Belone* Oken,

1816, in anticipation of a decision by the Commission on the general question of the availability of new names published in that author's *Lehrbuch*.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress for all purposes the undermentioned generic names :—

Raphistoma Rafinesque, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi),

Belone Oken, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) ;

(b) to validate the undermentioned generic names :—

Raphistoma Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda),

Belone Cuvier, 1817 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) ;

(2) to place on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " the two generic names specified in (1)(a) above ;

(3) to place the undermentioned generic names ,with the type species severally specified below, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

(a) *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847 (type species, by selection by de Koninck, 1881 : *Maclurea striatus* Emmons, 1842) ;

(b) *Belone* Cuvier, 1817 (type species, by absolute tautonymy : *Esox belone* Linnaeus, 1761) ;

(4) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

(a) *striatus* Emmons, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Maclurea striatus*) ;

(b) *belone* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Esox belone*) ;

(5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

" Teleosteus " Volger, 1860, and the trivial name " primaevus " Volger, 1860 (as

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 132) submitted by Dr. Adolf Zilch (Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany) asking the Commission to use their plenary

published in the combination "Teleosteus primaevus") (Class Anthozoa): suppression of, under the plenary powers

powers to suppress (i) the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and (ii) the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*) (Class Anthozoa) (Zilch, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 228–229). In this application Dr. Zilch explained that the foregoing generic and trivial names had been given by Volger to what he had believed was a fossil of an osseous fish, found in the Hunsrück-slate of Caub (Lower Devonian, Siegen division). In the preparation of a catalogue of the type specimens preserved in the Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Volger's unique type specimen had been found correctly arranged among the corals of the Hunsrück-slate. It was in fact a Devonian tetra-coral and was referable to the same species as that which Sandberger had named *Rhipidophyllum vulgare* in 1889. In the absence therefore of action by the Commission the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, would replace the name *Rhipidophyllum* Sandberger, 1889, and the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860, would replace the name *vulgare* Sandberger, 1889, for the tetra-coral which Volger had mistaken for a fossil fish. The name *Teleosteus* would be misleading for a genus of corals and its substitution for the name *Rhipidophyllum* would be objectionable in view of the designation "Rhipidophyllum-slate" introduced by Sandberger. It was for these reasons that the applicant invited the Commission to use their plenary powers in the manner proposed.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application had received the support of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America (by a majority of 10 votes to 1). Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego. California, U.S.A.) had also written to the Commission supporting the use of the plenary powers for the reasons stated in the application. No other specialist in the group concerned had expressed an opinion on the action proposed but an entomologist, Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had notified his strong personal objection to this proposal on the ground that the evidence brought forward in the application was not, in his view, sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION, the view was expressed that this was a case in which the plenary powers could appropriately be used and therefore that the application should be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*) ;

(b) to validate the generic name *Rhipidophyllum* Sandberger, 1889 and the trivial name *vulgare* Sandberger, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Rhipidophyllum vulgare*) ;

(2) to place the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860 on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *primaevus* Volger, 1860 (as published in the binominal combination *Teleosteus primaevus*) on the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to place the generic name *Rhipidophyllum* Sandberger, 1889, *Jahrb. nassau. Ver. Naturk.* **42** : 100 (Class Anthozoa) (type species, by monotypy ; *Rhipidophyllum vulgare* Sandberger, 1889), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(5) to place the trivial name *vulgare* Sandberger, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Rhipidophyllum vulgare*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

The trivial name " mcfarlandi " (as published in the binominal combination " Chromodoris mcfarlandi ") (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia) : emendation of, to " macfarlandi " under Article 19

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 122) submitted by Dr. D. P. Costello (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, U.S.A.) asking for a ruling on the question whether the trivial name *mcfarlandi* Cockerell, 1902 (published in the binominal combination *Chromodoris mcfarlandi*) (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia) should, under Article 19 of the *Règles*, be emended to *macfarlandi*, having regard to the fact that the author (Cockerell), when publishing this name, had stated that it had been selected in honour of Professor F. M. McFarland of Stanford University, whose name was actually not " McFarland " but " MacFarland " (Costello, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 232–233).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that on the evidence brought forward, it was " évident " that when, in publishing a trivial name for a new species of the genus *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855 (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia), dedicated in honour of a zoologist named " Macfarland ", Cockerell (1902) had spelt that trivial name as " *mcfarlandi* " instead of " *macfarlandi*," a " faute d'orthographe " had been committed and therefore that, under Article 19, the trivial name in question should be emended to read " *macfarlandi* " ;

(2) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) above.

The species commonly treated as having been named " Piroplasma annulatum " by Dschunkowsky and Luhs in 1904 (Class Sporozoa) Order Coccidiida) : (identity of) : consideration postponed for further information to be obtained regarding date of publication

5. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)122) submitted by Dr. G. Witenberg (Hebrew University Jerusalem) asking for a ruling on the question whether Sergent (1923) was justified under the *Règles* in rejecting the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs (as published in the binominal combination *Piroplasma annulatum*) (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) on the ground that, when that name was first published, the nominal species so named was a composite species (Witenberg, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 223–224) ;

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission (i) drawing attention to the fact that, although the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was universally attributed to Dschunkowsky & Luhs as from their paper " Die Piroplasmen der Rinder " published in 1904, an examination of that paper showed that neither the above nor any other scientific name was on that occasion given by those authors to the species responsible for Piroplasmosis in Cattle then described and figured, and (ii) enumerating efforts, so far unsuccessful, made by himself, as Secretary to the Commission, to ascertain when and by whom the name *Piproplasma annulatum* had first been published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the *Règles* (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 234–236).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the actual problem presented in this application offered no difficulty, in view of the decision

taken at the meeting noted in the margin to clarifiy the provisions of Article 31 in relation to the determination of the species to which a trivial name should apply when (as here) the nominal species to which it had originally been given was found to be a composite species. The feature of this case which was extraordinary was that, although this name had for over 40 years been treated by all authors as though it had been published in 1904 in the paper to which he had referred, not only was this not the case but it had so far proved impossible to determine with certainty where and by whom this name had first been published, despite the painstaking assistance of leading protozoologists. Even Dschunkowsky was unable to say when or where he had first published this name. The Commission would (the Acting President felt sure) wish to express its gratitude for the outstanding assistance rendered in this case both by Dr. C. M. Wenyon, C.M.G., C.B.E., F.R.S. (The Wellcome Foundation, London) and by Mr. D. A. E. Cabot, Chief Veterinary Officer of the United Kingdom Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. The Acting President added that, while a decision could now readily be taken on the limited issue raised by Dr. Witenberg, it was, he thought, desirable that a final effort should be made to determine the place where the name *Piroplasma annulatum* had first been published before an *Opinion* was rendered in this case. In the meantime it was necessary to treat the name *Piroplasma annulatum* as having been first published in 1905 in the Report of the VIIIth International Veterinary Congress, Budapest, 1904, that being the earliest place of publication of the name in question which it had so far been possible to trace. The name should be attributed to Dschunkowshy & Luhs, on whose behalf it had been communicated to the Budapest Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, pending the outcome of the further investigation referred to in (5) below, the name *Piroplasma annulatum* (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) should, on the information at present available, be treated as having been first published in 1905 in the *Report of the VIIIth International Veterinary Congress, Budapest*, 1904 : 290, where it appeared in a paper by Dschunkowsky & Luhs communicated to the Congress by M. G. Tartarowsky, and that this name should therefore be attributed to Dschunkowsky & Luhs, 1905 ;

(2) that Dr. E. Sergent was in error when in 1923 he rejected the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs on the ground that, when that

name had been first published, it had been applied to a composite species (the one pathogenic, the other non-pathogenic), for under the *Règles* a trivial name cannot be rejected on this ground, it being necessary to determine the species to which the name should be applied by the means provided by Article 31 ;

(3) that Dr. Witenberg himself in his application to the Commission (1947) applied the provisions of Article 31 to the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs, 1905, when he selected as the species to which that name should apply the pathogenic (as contrasted with the non-pathogenic) species included by Dschunkowsky & Luhs in the nominal species *Piroplasma annulatum* when they first published the name of that composite species, and therefore that the trivial names *parva* and *dispar*, as published by Sergent (1923) (in combination with the generic name *Theileria*) were objective synonyms of the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs (as published in 1905 in combination with the generic name *Piroplasma*) ;

(4) to place on record their thanks to Dr. C. M. Wenyon (Wellcome Foundation, London) and Mr. D. A. E. Cabot, Chief Veterinary Officer, United Kingdom Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, for their assiduous efforts to assist in the investigation of the complex bibliographical problems involved in this case ;

(5) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine, in consultation with specialists, the question whether there was any prospect of obtaining more precise information regarding the date on which, and the place in which, the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was first published ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above, as soon as the Secretary had either brought to a successful issue the inquiry referred to in (5) above or was satisfied that no further information regarding the date and place of first publication of the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was likely to be obtained.

" Trematapsis " Schmidt, 1866 (a genus based upon a misidentified type species) (Class

6. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)123) submitted by Dr. George M. Robertson (Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, U.S.A.), asking the Commission to use their plenary powers

Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

to designate *Trematapsis schmidti* Rohon, 1892 as the type species of the genus *Trematapsis* Schmidt, 1866 (Class Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci) (Robertson, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 237–238). It was explained that this was a case of a genus based on a misidentified type species. Schmidt (1866) had established the genus *Trematapsis* for a single species which, in fact, at that time was undescribed and unnamed and had misidentified that species with the species *Cephalaspis schrenkii* Pander, 1856. Under the presumption (laid down in *Opinion* 168) that the author of a genus is to be assumed to have identified correctly the species referred by him thereto, the type species of the genus *Trematapsis* Schmidt was the true *Cephalaspis schrenkii* of Pander. The recognition of this species as the type species of *Trematapsis* Schmidt would run counter to existing practice, would upset the family name TREMATASPIDAE and would lead to confusion. It was for these reasons that the Commission were asked to use their plenary powers to validate existing nomenclatorial practice by designating *Trematapsis schmidti* Rohon, 1892 (the species on which, in fact, Schmidt based the genus *Trematapsis*), as the type species of the genus *Trematapsis* Schmidt, 1866.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present was a clear case of a genus based upon a misidentified type species. The proposal submitted by Dr. Robertson had received the support of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, which (by a majority of 7 votes to 3) had passed a resolution in its favour. No other specialists in the group concerned had expressed opinions on the action proposed, but an entomologist, Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had notified his strong personal oppostion to this proposal on the ground that in his (Dr. Blackwelder's) opinion, the evidence brought forward in the application was not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that this case fell within the ambit of *Opinions* 65 and 168 and should therefore be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside the type designation made by Schmidt for, and all subsequent selections of type species made prior to the present decision in respect of, the genus *Trematapsis* Schmidt, 1866 (Class Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci) ;

(b) to designate *Trematastpis schmidti* Rohon, 1892, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Trematastpis* Schmidt, 1866, with the type species designated in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *schmidti* Rohon, 1892 (as published in the binominal combination *Trematastpis schmidti*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Anomia pecten " Linnaeus, 1758 : identification of, under the plenary powers, with the species of the Order Protremata (Class Brachiopoda) commonly known as " Strophomena pecten " (Linnaeus, 1758)

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)130) submitted by Dr. Alan Wood (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) asking the Commission to use their plenary powers to identify *Anomia pecten* Linnaeus, 1758, with the species belonging to the Order Protremata (Class Brachiopoda) commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) (Wood, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 239). It was explained that the above was the sense in which this Linnean name was currently used, but an examination of the figure quoted by Linnaeus in his original description (Lister's pl. 9, fig. 49) represented an entirely different species, namely the lamellibranch *Pecten papyraceus* Sowerby, 1822 (now commonly known as *Pterinopecten papyraceus* (Sowerby, 1822)). Both the brachiopod and the lamellibranch were widely distributed species and for over 100 years had been cited by many authors under the trivial names *pecten* Linnaeus and *papyraceus* Sowerby respectively. Great confusion would ensue if it were necessary to transfer the first of these names to the lamellibranch (*papyraceus* Sowerby).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that this proposal had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, which (by a majority of 9 votes to 2) had adopted a resolution supporting the action proposed. In addition, Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.) had informed the Commission that he favoured the use of the plenary powers in this case. No objection to this proposal had been received from any source. The present petition arose from a situation which occurred not uncommonly in connection with Linnean names, for, as he had himself found when he was working on the Linnean butterflies. Linnaeus (by his own admission)

had on occasion taken at second hand bibliographical references furnished to him, at his own invitation, by correspondents who had access to books not accessible to himself. It might be that this was what had happened in the present instance. If, as he hoped, the Commission approved the present proposal, it would be necessary to tie down the identity of the species to which in future the trivial name *pecten* Linnaeus, 1758, was to apply by anchoring it to a well authenticated description or figure of the species now known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the trivial name *pecten* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia pecten*) should apply to the species of the Order Protremata of the Class Brachiopoda, commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758), i.e. the species determined as *Schellwienella pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) by Dalman (J. W.), 1828, *K. svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl.*, 1827 : 110 pl. 1, figs. 6a–d (as *Orthis pecten*) ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " :—

pecten Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia pecten*), as identified in (1) above ;

papyraceus Sowerby, 1822 (as published in the binominal combination *Pecten papyraceus*) ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Chinchilla" Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia), question of type species of : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.) 141) submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (Chicago, U.S.A.) for a ruling on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia) (Osgood, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 240–242). In this paper Dr. Osgood explained that Bennett had established the genus *Chinchilla* on the basis of the Chilean species (or subspecies) of the true " Chinchilla." Bennett did not designate a type species for the genus *Chinchilla*, but for the reason explained it was none the less clearly monotypical. Unfortunately, however, Bennett had applied to the single species which he described

the name *Chinchilla lanigera*, not as a new name but as the feminine form of the earlier name *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782. A careful examination by Prell (1934) of Molina's, description had led that specialist to conclude that the species described by Molina was not a true "Chinchilla" but was the so-called "False Chinchilla" or Chinchilla Rat, which was currently placed in the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse, 1837, and did not belong even to the same family as the true Chinchilla. Three forms of true Chinchilla were recognised by specialists (from Chile, Peru and Bolivia respectively). The first of these to receive a name (*Eriomys chinchilla* Lichtenstein, 1829) could not be regarded as the type species of Bennett's genus *Chinchilla*, for that nominal species was based on the Peruvian animal, whereas Bennett's genus was based on that from Chile. Dr. Osgood had concluded that, owing to the prolonged misuse of Molina's trivial name *laniger*, the true Chinchilla from Chile did not receive a scientific name until in 1934 Prell named it *Chinchilla velligera*. If the Chinchilla Rat (*Mus laniger* Molina) were to be recognised as the type species of *Chinchilla* Bennett in place of the true Chinchilla, long-continued confusion of technical and vernacular names would be inevitable. These difficulties would be completely avoided it if were possible to set aside the claim of the name *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, to be taken into account in considering the question of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had discussed this case with Dr. Philip Hershkovitch while in Chicago during his recent visit to the United States. He had then asked Dr. Hershkovitz to furnish him with a statement setting out his views. Dr. Hershkovitz had now done this. In this statement he took the view (1) that the *Mus laniger* of Molina, 1782, was a composite nominal species based in part upon the true *Chinchilla* of Chile (i.e. the species named *Chinchilla velligera* by Prell in 1934), partly upon the False Chinchilla (i.e. the Chinchilla Rat now referred to the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse), and in part "on figments of the imagination", and (2) that Bennett's use in 1829 of the trivial name *laniger* Molina (in the feminine form *lanigera*) constituted a perfectly valid selection under Article 31 of the true Chinchilla of Chile (one of the originally included species) to be the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, should adhere. Dr. Hershkovitz therefore recommended that the Commission should give a ruling in this sense.

Continuing, the Acting President said that it was evident that the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, was monotypical from Bennett's standpoint and therefore that under the *Règles* the type species was *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, the only nominal species referred to the genus by Bennett. The first question which must be cleared up before a decision could be taken on the present case was a taxonomic one, namely whether, in the original description of *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, that name was (1) applied to the true Chinchilla of Chile, or (2) was the name of a composite species which included the foregoing species, or (3) applied neither in whole nor in part to that species. On this subject the evidence submitted was conflicting: Prell (1934) considered that this name applied not to the true Chinchilla (of Chile) but to the Chinchilla Rat (at that time known as *Abrocoma cuvieri* Waterhouse, 1837); the late Dr. Osgood did not discuss in his application to the Commission (1947) the species to which he considered that the trivial name *laniger* Molina correctly applied, but stated definitely that it did not apply to the true Chinchilla of Chile; in an earlier paper (1936) he had however (a) rejected the name *laniger* Molina not only for the true Chinchilla of Chile but also for the Chilean Chinchilla Rat (which he had called *Abrocoma bennetti* Waterhouse, 1837); Hershkovitz (*in litt.*, 24th March, 1948) had considered that *Mus laniger* Molina, when first published, had been the name of a composite species, which included, *inter alia*, both the true Chinchilla (of Chile) and the False Chinchilla (= the Chinchilla Rat) but that Bennett, acting under Article 31, had in 1829 definitely restricted this name to the true Chinchilla. Thus, according to the point of view of the individual systematist, the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, was either (1) a *nomen dubium* (Osgood) (2) the oldest available name for the False Chinchilla (Chinchilla Rat) (Prell) or (3) the oldest available name for the true Chinchilla of Chile (Hershkovitz). If Prell's contention had secured general support from mammalogists (which it had not), the present case would have been simple, for the name *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, would have been the name of a genus based upon a misidentified type species, and, in view of the " long-continued confusion of technical and vernacular names " (Osgood, 1947) which would follow the substitution of the Chinchilla Rat (*Abrocoma* sp.) for the true Chinchilla of Chile as the type species of *Chinchilla* Bennett, there would have been a strong case for the Commission (acting on the principle laid down in *Opinion* 168) using their plenary powers to designate as the type species of that genus the true Chinchilla of Chile under whatever was its oldest available name. But Prell's

identification of *Mus laniger* Molina was contested, though from different points of view, both by Osgood and by Hershkovitz. In these circumstances, it appeared to him (the Acting President) that it would be impossible for the Commission to deal with the question of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, until the identity of the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina applied had been determined or at least until the status of that name had been settled. On this question it was desirable to enlarge the field of evidence by obtaining the views of other leading mammalogists. If the consensus of opinion favoured either the view that the name *Mus laniger* Molina was a *nomen dubium* or that it applied to the Chinchilla Rat and not to the true Chinchilla of Chile, the way would be cleared for the Commission to suppress that name under their plenary powers to prevent the confusion which would arise, in the first case if the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett had to be rejected as a *nomen dubium* (as would happen if its type species were to be unrecognisable), and in the second case, if under the *Règles* it were found to be necessary to substitute the Chinchilla Rat for the true Chinchilla of Chile as the type species of *Chinchilla* Bennett. If however the consensus of opinion favoured the view (on taxonomic grounds) that the nominal species *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, had originally been a composite species comprising (*inter alia*) both the true Chinchilla of Chile and also the Chinchilla Rat, it would be necessary for the Commission to determine by what author and where one of the originally included species had been selected under Article 31 to be the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, should adhere. On this question it appeared to him (the Acting President) that action such as that by Bennett (1829) in applying the name of a previously published composite nominal species to a single species without indicating in any way that he was conscious of so doing could not at any time have been correctly treated as the selection by that author of the species in question (the true Chinchilla of Chile) to be the species to which the previously published trivial name (*laniger* Molina) should adhere, for under Article 31 such a process of selection was governed by the provisions, *mutatis mutandis*, of Rule (g) in Article 30, which laid it down that the expression " select the type " was to be " rigidly construed " and that " the mention of a species as an illustration or example " did not constitute a selection of a type. However this might be, the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to clarify the meaning of Article 31 certainly ruled out the argument that Bennett had effectively selected the true Chinchilla of Chile to be

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (if originally published as the trivial name of a composite nominal species) should adhere. If therefore specialists were in general to agree that, as originally published, *Mus laniger* Molina was a composite species, it would be necessary to re-examine the literature, in order to determine where, and in what manner, the provisions of Article 31 had been effectively applied to that name.

THE COMMISSION :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 38)

(1) agreed that, in view of the provision initially laid down in *Opinions* 65 and 168 and now—as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin—to be incorporated in the *Règles* (that the author of a genus is to be assumed to have correctly identified the species referred by him thereto), the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, was *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, the genus being monotypical from Bennett's standpoint and the above being the only species specifically cited ;

(2) took note that the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the binominal combination *Mus laniger*) was variously regarded by specialists (a) as a *nomen dubium*, (b) as the oldest available name for the true Chinchilla of Chile (i.e. the species named or renamed *Chinchilla velligera* by Prell in 1934), and (c) as the oldest available name for the False Chinchilla or Chinchilla Rat (i.e. the species commonly referred to the genus *Abrocoma* Waterhouse, 1837, to which the trivial names *bennetti* and *cuvieri* had been given by that author at the time when he first published the generic name *Abrocoma*) ;

(3) agreed that, before a decision could be taken on the question whether the use of their plenary powers was necessary to prevent the confusion in technical and vernacular names which would arise if, under the *Règles*, it were to be necessary to substitute the Chinchilla Rat (*bennetti* Waterhouse, 1837) for the true Chinchilla of Chile (*velligera* Prell) as the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, it was essential to determine the identity of the species to which the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782 (as published in the binominal combination *Mus laniger*) should be applied ;

(4) in view of (3) above, invited the Secretary to the Commission to confer with interested specialists

with a view to ascertaining as rapidly as possible (a) their views on the alternative interpretations of the trivial name *laniger* Molina, 1782, specified in (2) above, and (b) in so far as specialists regarded the above name as having been applied to a composite species at the time when it was published, their views on the question of the occasion (if any) on which a later author, acting under Article 31 of the *Règles*, had definitely selected one of the originally included species to be the species to which the foregoing trivial name should adhere ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

(5) agreed to defer further consideration of the application in regard to the identity of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1729, submitted by the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood until the information asked for in (4) above was available

" Aturoidea ", a term applied by Vredenberg (1925) to a " section " of the genus " Nautilus " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea) : declared to be of sub-generic status as from date of being so published

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)139) submitted by Dr. Otto Haas (at that time of the British Museum (Natural History), London) asking for a ruling on the question whether the term *Aturoidea* introduced by Vredenberg (1925) as the name for a " section " of the genus *Nautilus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea) was to be accepted as of subgeneric status as from the date of being so published (Haas, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 243–244). It was explained in the application that two years after the publication by Vredenberg of the term *Aturoidea* (i.e. in 1927) Spath had published the sub-generic name *Paraturia* for the same group. If Vredenberg's *Aturoidea* could properly be accepted as from 1925, the date when it was published, the name would take precedence over *Paraturia* Spath, 1927. If, on the other hand, *Aturoidea* could not properly be accepted as having been published in 1925 as a subgeneric name, the name *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, instead of being a synonym, would be a valid name. Cotter (1928), when editing Vredenberg's manuscripts in preparation for the publication of a posthumous volume, had first rejected the claims of *Aturoidea* to be a subgeneric name as from Vredenberg, 1925, and had therefore accepted as available the name *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, but later (in the same volume) he had changed his mind, accepting *Aturoidea* Vredenberg as an available name as from 1925 and accordingly sinking *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, as a synonym. This latter view was accepted by Spath himself (1929), and by Schenk (1931) and Miller and Thompson

(1933, 1935). Dr. Haas, on the other hand, was doubtful whether Vredenberg had in fact intended to establish a new subgenus, partly because he applied the term " section " to the word *Aturoidea* and partly because of the form of the termination (*-oidea*) selected by that author in constructing the term *Aturoidea*.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application had been considered by the members of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, but no vote thereon had been taken by the Committee as a whole. From the individual comments so obtained it appeared that the general feeling of the Committee was in favour of the International Commission being asked to give a clear-cut ruling regarding the status to be accorded to names proposed for sections. On the general question of the desirability of accepting such names (and in particular whether the name *Aturoidea* Vredenberg, 1925, should be accepted), opinion in the Committee seemed to be divided : two members (Wells, Cooper) favouring the rejection of section names, and four (Reeside, Simpson, Palmer and Frizzell) supporting their recognition, the remaining five members taking no definite stand beyond supporting the request for a ruling from the International Commission.

IT WAS STATED in the discussion of this case that the present was no mere isolated example ; many similar cases were to be found in the literature of different parts of the Animal Kingdom ; in some instances the original author had applied the expression " section " (or a corresponding expression) in connection with terms used in this way, but in many other instances there was nothing to show the precise intention of the author in introducing the expression concerned. In these circumstances it would be impossible to devise a rule, even were such desirable, to determine when in such cases a term so introduced was to be accepted as having status as a subgeneric name as from the date of being so published and when it should not. The only safe course, in this as in other similar cases, was for the *Règles* to rely not upon the alleged intentions of an author but upon the objective evidence provided by what he actually published. If an author published for a group of species within a single genus a term consisting of a Latin or latinised word in the nominative singular or, if the word so published was not a classical Latin word, a word having a termination consistent with its being regarded as a word in the nominative singular, that word should be accepted as having been published by the author concerned as a subgeneric name. It was desirable that this should be made clear in the *Règles;* the instance submitted by Dr. Haas

might usefully be cited as an example of the proposition so laid down.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where an author applied to a group or to each of a number of groups of species within a given genus a term consisting of a Latin or latinised word in the nominative singular or, if the word selected was not a classical Latin word, a word having a termination consistent with its being in the nominative singular, the word so published was to be treated as having status as a subgeneric name as from the date of such publication irrespective of whether the author in using such a term expressly qualified it by the expression " section " or its equivalent, and that the following example should be inserted at the close of the foregoing provision : the term *Aturoidea* published by Vredenberg (1925) as the name of a section of the genus *Nautilus* Linnaeus, 1758, being a word having a termination consistent with its being a latinised noun in the nominative singular, ranks as a subgeneric name as from Vredenberg, 1925, and accordingly has priority over *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, expressly published as the name of a subgenus containing the same group of species.

" Bradycellus " Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (proposed use of the plenary powers for) consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) a paper by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England) (file Z.N.(S.)158) expressing the opinion that confusion would arise if *Harpalus placidus* Gyll., 1827, were to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) in accordance with the selection by Westwood (1838) and Hope (1838), and expressing the hope that, in order to avoid this confusion, the International Commission would set aside the foregoing type selections under their plenary powers and designate *Carabus collaris* Paykull, 1798, to be type species of this genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 245) ;

(b) a paper by Sir Guy Marshall (formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London), Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring) supporting

the conclusions reached by Mr. Andrewes (see (a) above) and endorsing his recommendation that the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed (Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 246–247).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said the present was the first of a series of recommendations relating to generic names in the family CARABIDAE prepared by the Coleoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London, by which body these recommendations had been submitted to the Commission. The only objection which had been lodged in the present case, which had been received from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) was concerned not so much with the substance of the application as with its form, Dr. Blackwelder taking the view that the data submitted with the application were not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it would be advisable in the present case to ask the Royal Entomological Society of London to furnish a supplementary statement dealing especially with the question of the extent to which confusion might be expected if the plenary powers were not used in this case.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the name *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in this case the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed ;

(2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London and at the same time to ask for a supplementary statement setting out the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in the case referred to in (1) above ;

(3) to defer taking a decision on the foregoing case until the supplementary statement, asked for in (2) above, was available.

"Carabus" Linnaeus, 1758 Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera): designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(a) an application (file Z.N.(S.)158) submitted by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England) that the plenary powers should be used to set aside the action of Curtis (1833) and Westwood (1838) in selecting *Carabus violaceus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera), and that in place of that species *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758, should be designated as the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 247) ;

(b) a paper by Sir Guy Marshall (formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London), Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring), supporting and elaborating the proposal submitted by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (see (a) above) (Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 248).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the only objection which had been lodged against the action proposed in this case was similar to, and came from the same source as, the objection which the Commission had just considered in the case of the name *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837. The Commission would no doubt give due weight to the objection so advanced. In his (the Acting President's) opinion, it was necessary, however, to bear in mind that the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus was one of the best known of all the genera in the Class Insecta ; in consequence this generic name fell in the class of names, to applications regarding which (as had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin) the Commission should give special consideration with a view to securing, *inter alia*, that long-forgotten or long-ignored type selections should not be permitted to introduce instability by disturbing current nomenclatorial practice. In this case, therefore, his recommendation was that the Commission should use their plenary powers to grant the desired relief.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

GENERAL AGREEMENT was expressed with the views expressed by the Acting President.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) made previous to the present decision ;

(b) to designate *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758, with the type species specified in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the trivial name *granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Carabus granulatus*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Harpalus " Latreille [1802-1803] and " Ophonus " Stephens, 1827, " Lebia " Latreille [1802-1803], " Tachys " Stephens, 1828, and " Trechus " Schellenberg, 1806 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (application for the use of the plenary powers for) : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

12. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the undermentioned applications concerning generic names in the Order Coleoptera (Class Insecta) (file Z.N.(S.)158) submitted (i) by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England) and (ii) by Sir Guy Marshall (formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London), Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London) and Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring) requesting the Commission to use its plenary powers :—

(a) (i) to set aside the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Carabus ruficornis* Fabricius, 1775, as the type species of *Harpalus* Latreille [1802–1803], and to designate in the place of that species *Carabus aeneus* Fabricius, 1775, to be the type species of the foregoing genus, and (ii) to set aside the selection by Curtis (1827) of *Carabus germanus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827, and to designate in the place of that species *Carabus obscurus* Fabricius, 1792, to be the type species of *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827 (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 249 ; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, **1** : 250–251) ;

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Twenty-one Parts have been published and this volume is now complete except for the index which will be published in a concluding Part.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM AND SON, LTD., Westminster London